NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCVI.

NOVEMBER, 1889.

IS DIVORCE WRONG?

BY CARDINAL GIBBONS, BISHOP HENRY C. POTTER, AND COLONEL ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

The attention of the public has been particularly directed of late to the abuses of divorce, and to the facilities afforded by the complexities of American law, and by the looseness of its administration, for the disruption of family ties. Therefore THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has opened its pages for the thorough discussion of the subject in its moral, social, and religious aspects, and some of the most eminent leaders of modern thought have contributed their opinions. The Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., who is a specialist on the subject of divorce, has prepared some statistics touching the matter, and, with the assistance of Bishop Potter, the four following questions have been formulated as a basis for the discussion:

1. Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?
2. Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?
3. What is the effect of divorce on the integrity of the family?
4. Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

EDITOR N. A. R.

Introduction by the Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

I AM to introduce this discussion with some facts and make a few suggestions upon them. In the dozen years of my work at this problem I have steadily insisted upon a broad basis of fact

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the only foundation of sound opinion. We now have a great statistical advance in the report of the Department of Labor. A few of these statistics will serve the present purpose.

There were in the United States 9,937 divorces reported for the year 1867 and 25,535 for 1886, or a total of 328,716 in the twenty years. This increase is more than twice as great as the population, and has been remarkably uniform throughout the period. With the exception of New York, perhaps Delaware, and the three or four States where special legislative reforms have been secured, the increase covers the country and has been more than twice the gain in population. The South apparently felt the movement later than the North and West, but its greater rapidity there will apparently soon obliterate most existing differences. The movement is well-nigh as universal in Europe as here. Thirteen European countries, including Canada, had 6,540 divorces in 1876 and 10,909 in 1886—an increase of 67 per cent. In the same period the increase with us was 72.5 per cent. But the ratios of divorce to population are here generally three or four times greater than in Europe. The ratios to marriage in the United States are sometimes as high as 1 to 10, 1 to 9, or even a little more for single years. In heathen Japan for three years they were more than 1 to 3. But divorce there is almost wholly left to the regulation of the family, and practically optional with the parties. It is a retransferrence of the wife by a simple writing to her own family.

1. The increase of divorce is one of several evils affecting the family. Among these are hasty or ill-considered marriages, the decline of marriage and the decrease of children,—too generally among classes pecuniarily best able to maintain domestic life,—the probable increase in some directions of marital infidelity and sexual vice, and last, but not least, a tendency to reduce the family to a minimum of force in the life of society. All these evils should be studied and treated in their relations to each other. Carefully-conducted investigations alone can establish these latter statements beyond dispute, although there can be little doubt of their general correctness as here carefully made. And the conclusion is forced upon us that the toleration of the increase of divorce, touching as it does the vital bond of the family, is so far forth a confession of our western civilization that it despairs of all remedies for ills of the family, and is becoming willing, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great degree, to look away from all true remedies to a dissolution of the family by the courts in all serious cases. If this were our settled purpose, it would look like giving up the idea of producing and protecting a family increasingly capable of enduring to the end of its natural existence. If the drift of things on this subject during the present century may be taken as prophetic, our civilization moves in an opposite direction in its treatment of the family from its course with the individual.

2. Divorce, including these other evils related to the family, is preëminently a social problem. It should therefore be reached by all the forces of our great social institutions—religious, educational, industrial, and political. Each of these should be brought to bear on it proportionately and in coöperation with the others. But I can here take up only one or two lines for further suggestion.

3. The causes of divorces, like those of most social evils, are often many and intricate. The statistics for this country, when the forty-three various statutory causes are reduced to a few classes, show that 20 per cent. of the divorces were based on adultery, 16 on cruelty, 38 were granted for desertion, 4 for drunkenness, less than 3 for neglect to provide, and so on. But these tell very little, except that it is easier or more congenial to use one or another of the statutory causes, just as the old "omnibus clause," which gave general discretion to the courts in Connecticut, and still more in some other States, was made to cover many cases. A special study of forty-five counties in twelve States, however, shows that drunkenness was *a* direct or indirect cause in 20.1 per cent. of 29,665 cases. That is, it could be found either alone or in conjunction with others, directly or indirectly, in one-fifth of the cases.

4. Laws and their administration affect divorce. New York grants absolute divorce for only one cause, and New Jersey for two. Yet New York has many more divorces in proportion to population, due largely to a looser system of administration. In seventy counties of twelve States 68 per cent. of the applications are granted. The enactment of a more stringent law is immediately followed by a decrease of divorces, from which there is a tendency to recover. Personally, I think stricter methods of administration, restrictions upon remarriage, proper delays in hearing suits, and some penal inflictions for cruelty, desertion,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neglect of support, as well as for adultery, would greatly reduce divorces, even without removing a single statutory cause. There would be fewer unhappy families, not more. For people would then look to real remedies instead of confessing the hopelessness of remedy by appeals to the courts. A multitude of petty ills and many utterly wicked frauds and other abuses would disappear. "Your present methods," said a Nova Scotian to a man from Maine a few years ago, "are simply ways of multiplying and magnifying domestic ills." There is much force in this. But let us put reform of marriage laws along with these measures.

5. The evils of conflicting and diverse marriage and divorce laws are doing immense harm. The mischiefs through which innocent parties are defrauded, children rendered illegitimate, inheritance made uncertain, and actual imprisonments for bigamy grow out of divorce and remarriage, are well known to most. Uniformity through a national law or by conventions of the States has been strongly urged for many years. Uniformity is needed. But for one, I have long discouraged too early action, because the problem is too difficult, the consequences too serious, and the elements of it still too far out of our reach for any really wise action at present. The government report grew immediately out of this conviction. It will, I think, abundantly justify the caution. For it shows that uniformity could affect at the utmost only a small percentage of the total divorces in the United States. *Only 19.9 per cent. of all the divorced who were married in this country obtained their divorces in a different State from the one in which their marriage had taken place, in all these twenty years, 80.1 per cent. having been divorced in the State where married.* Now, marriage on the average lasts 9.17 years before divorce occurs, which probably is nearly two-fifths the length of a married life before its dissolution by death. From this 19.9 per cent. there must, therefore, be subtracted the large migration of married couples for legitimate purposes, in order to get any fair figure to express the migration for divorce. But the movement of the native population away from the State of birth is 22 or 23 per cent. This, however, includes all ages. For all who believe that divorce itself is generally a great evil, the conclusion is apparently inevitable that the question of uniformity, serious as it is, is a very small part of the great legal problem demanding solution at our hands. This general problem, aside from its graver features in the more im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mediate sphere of sociology and religion, must evidently tax our publicists and statesmen severely. The old temptation to meet special evils by general legislation besets us on this subject. I think comparative and historical study of the law of the family, (the *Familienrecht* of the Germans), especially if the movement of European law be seen, points toward the need of a pretty comprehensive and thorough examination of our specific legal problem of divorce and marriage law in this fuller light, before much legislation is undertaken.

SAMUEL W. DIKE.

HOWEVER much men may differ in their views of the nature and attributes of the matrimonial contract, and in their concept of the rights and obligations of the marriage state, no one will deny that these are grave questions ; since upon marriage rests the family, and upon the family rest society, civilization, and the highest interests of religion and the state. Yet, strange to say, divorce, the deadly enemy of marriage, stalks abroad to-day bold and unblushing, a monster licensed by the laws of Christian states to break hearts, wreck homes, and ruin souls. And passing strange is it, too, that so many, wise and far-seeing in less weighty concerns, do not appear to see in the ever-growing power of divorce a menace not only to the sacredness of the marriage institution, but even to the fair social fabric reared upon matrimony as its corner-stone.

God instituted in Paradise the marriage state and sanctified it. He established its law of unity and declared its indissolubility. By divine authority Adam spoke when of his wife he said: "This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh ; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they shall be two in one flesh."* But like other things on earth, marriage suffered in the fall ; and little by little polygamy and divorce began to assert themselves against the law of matrimonial unity and indissolubility. Yet the ideal of the marriage institution never faded away. It survived, not only among the chosen people, but even among the nations of heathendom, disfigured much, 'tis true, but with its ancient beauty never wholly destroyed.

When, in the fulness of time, Christ came to restore the things that were perishing, he reasserted in clear and unequivocal terms

* Gen., ii., 23-24.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sanctity, unity, and indissolubility of marriage. Nay, more. He gave to this state added holiness and a dignity higher far than it had "from the beginning." He made marriage a sacrament, made it the type of his own never-ending union with his one, spotless spouse, the church. St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, says: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh."*

In defence of Christian marriage, the church was compelled from the earliest days of her existence to do frequent and stern battle. But cultured pagan, and rough barbarian, and haughty Christian lord were met and conquered. Men were taught to master passion, and Christian marriage, with all its rights secured and reverenced, became a ruling power in the world.

The Council of Trent, called, in the throes of the mighty moral upheaval of the sixteenth century, to deal with the new state of things, again proclaimed to a believing and an unbelieving world the Catholic doctrine of the holiness, unity, and indissolubility of marriage, and the unlawfulness of divorce. The council declared no new dogmas: it simply reaffirmed the common teaching of the church for centuries. But some of the most hallowed attributes of marriage seemed to be objects of peculiar detestation to the new teachers, and their abolition was soon demanded. "The leaders in the changes of matrimonial law," writes Professor Woolsey, "were the Protestant reformers themselves, and that almost from the beginning of the movement. . . . The reformers, when they discarded the sacramental view of marriage and the celibacy of the clergy, had to make out a new doctrine of marriage and of divorce."† The "new doctrine of marriage and of divorce," pleasing as it was to the sensual man, was speedily learned and as speedily put in practice. The sacredness with which Christian marriage had been hedged around began to be more and more openly trespassed upon, and restive

* Ephes., v., 25-31.

† "Divorce and Divorce Legislation," by Theodore D. Woolsey, 2d Ed., p. 126.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shoulders wearied more and more quickly of the marriage yoke when divorce promised freedom for newer joys.

To our own time the logical consequences of the "new doctrine" have come. To-day "abyss calls upon abyss," change calls for change, laxity calls for license. Divorce is now a recognized presence in high life and low; and polygamy, the first-born of divorce, sits shameless in palace and in hovel. Yet the teacher that feared not to speak the words of truth in bygone ages is not silent now. In no uncertain tones, the church proclaims to the world to-day the unchangeable law of the strict unity and absolute indissolubility of valid and consummated Christian marriage.

To the question then, "Can divorce from the bond of marriage ever be allowed?" the Catholic can only answer NO. And for this NO, his first and last and best reason can be but this: "*Thus saith the Lord.*"

As time goes on the wisdom of the church in absolutely forbidding divorce from the marriage bond grows more and more plain even to the many who deny to this prohibition a divine and authoritative sanction. And nowhere is this more true than in our own country. Yet our experience of the evils of divorce is but the experience of every people that has cherished this monster.

Let us take but a hasty view of the consequences of divorce in ancient times. Turn only to pagan Greece and Rome, two peoples that practised divorce most extensively. In both we find divorce weakening their primitive virtue and making their latter corruption more corrupt. Among the Greeks morality declined as material civilization advanced. Divorce grew easy and common, and purity and peace were banished from the family circle. Among the Romans divorce was not common until the latter days of the Republic. Then the flood-gates of immorality were opened, and, with divorce made easy, came rushing in corruption of morals among both sexes and in every walk of life. "Passion, interest, or caprice," Gibbon, the historian, tells us, "suggested daily motives for the dissolution of marriage; a word, a sign, a message, a letter, the mandate of a freedman, declared the separation; the most tender of human connections was degraded to a transient society of profit or pleasure." * Each succeeding generation witnessed moral corruption more general, moral degradation more profound; men and women were no longer ashamed of

* "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Milman's Ed., Vol. III., p. 236.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

licentiousness; until at length the nation that became mighty because built on a pure family fell when its corner-stone crumbled away in rottenness.

Heedless of the lessons taught by history, modern nations, too, have made trial of divorce. In Europe, wherever the new gospel of marriage and divorce has had notable influence, divorce has been legalized; and in due proportion to the extent of that influence causes for divorce have been multiplied, the bond of marriage more and more recklessly broken, and the obligations of that sacred state more and more shamelessly disregarded. In our own country the divorce evil has grown more rapidly than our growth and strengthened more rapidly than our strength. Mr. Carroll D. Wright, in a special report on the statistics of marriage and divorce made to Congress in February, 1889, places the number of divorces in the United States in 1867 at 9,937, and the number in 1886 at 25,535. These figures show an increase of the divorce evil much out of proportion to our increase in population. The knowledge that divorces can easily be procured encourages hasty marriages and equally hasty separations. Legislators and judges in some States are encouraging inventive genius in the art of finding new causes for divorce. Frequently the most trivial and even ridiculous pretexts are recognized as sufficient for the rupture of the marriage bond; and in some States divorce can be obtained "without publicity," and even without the knowledge of the defendant—in such cases generally an innocent wife. Crime has sometimes been committed for the very purpose of bringing about a divorce, and cases are not rare in which plots have been laid to blacken the reputation of a virtuous spouse in order to obtain legal freedom for new nuptials. Sometimes, too, there is collusion between the married parties to obtain divorce. One of them trumps up charges; the other does not oppose the suit; and judgment is entered for the plaintiff. Every daily newspaper tells us of divorces applied for or granted, and the public sense of decency is constantly being shocked by the disgusting recital of divorce-court scandals.

We are filled with righteous indignation at Mormonism; we brand it as a national disgrace, and justly demand its suppression. Why? Because, forsooth, the Mormons are polygamists. Do we forget that there are two species of polygamy—simultaneous and successive? Mormons practise without legal recognition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first species; while among us the second species is indulged in, and with the sanction of law, by thousands in whose nostrils Mormonism is a stench and an abomination. The Christian press and pulpit of the land denounce the Mormons as "an adulterous generation," but too often deal very tenderly with Christian polygamists. Why? Is Christian polygamy less odious in the eyes of God than Mormon polygamy? Among us, 'tis true, the one is looked upon as more *respectable* than the other. Yet we know that the Mormons, as a class, care for their wives and children; while Christian polygamists but too often leave wretched wives to starve, slave, or sin, and leave miserable children a public charge. "O divorced and much-married Christian," says the polygamous dweller by Salt Lake, "pluck first the beam from thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to pluck the mote from the eye of thy much-married, but undivorced, Mormon brother."

It follows logically from the Catholic doctrine of the unity and indissolubility of marriage, and the consequent prohibition of divorce from the marital bond, that no one, even though divorced *a vinculo* by the civil power, can be allowed by the church to take another consort during the lifetime of the true wife or husband, and such connection the church can but hold as sinful. It is written: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."* Of course, I am well aware that upon the words of our Saviour as found in St. Matthew, Chap. xix., 9, many base the right of divorce from the marriage bond for adultery, with permission to remarry. But, as is well known, the Catholic Church, upon the concurrent testimony of the Evangelists Mark† and Luke,‡ and upon the teaching of St. Paul,§ interprets our Lord's words quoted by St. Matthew as simply permitting, on account of adultery, divorce from bed and board, with no right to either party to marry another.

But even if divorce *a vinculo* were not forbidden by divine law, how inadequate a remedy would it be for the evils for which so many deem it a panacea. "Divorce *a vinculo*," as Dr. Brownson truly says, "logically involves divorce *ad libitum*."‖ Now,

* Mark, x., 11, 12. † Mark, x., 11, 12. ‡ Luke, xvi., 18. § I. Cor., vii., 10, 11.
‖ Essay on "The Family—Christian and Pagan."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what reason is there to suppose that parties divorced and remated will be happier in the new connection than in the old? As a matter of fact, many persons have been divorced a number of times. Sometimes, too, it happens that, after a period of separation, divorced parties repent of their folly, reunite, and are again divorced. Indeed, experience clearly proves that unhappiness among married people frequently does not arise so much from "mutual incompatibility" as from causes inherent in one or both of the parties—causes that would be likely to make a new union as wretched as the old one. There is wisdom in the pithy saying of a recent writer: "Much ill comes, not because men and women are married, but because they are fools."*

There are some who think that the absolute prohibition of divorce does not contribute to the purity of society, and are therefore of opinion that divorce with liberty to remarry does good in this regard. He who believes the matrimonial bond indissoluble, divorce *a vinculo* evil, and the connection resulting from it criminal, can only say: "Evil should not be done that good may come." But, after all, would even passing good come from this greater freedom? In a few exceptional cases—*Yes:* in the vast majority of cases—*No.* The trying of divorce as a safeguard of purity is an old experiment, and an unsuccessful one. In Rome adulteries increased as divorces were multiplied. After speaking of the facility and frequency of divorce among the Romans, Gibbon adds:

"A specious theory is confuted by this free and perfect experiment, which demonstrates that the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue. The facility of separation would destroy all mutual confidence, and inflame every trifling dispute. The minute difference between a husband and a stranger, which might so easily be removed, might still more easily be forgotten."†

How *apropos* in this connection are the words of Professor Woolsey:

"Nothing is more startling than to pass from the first part of the eighteenth to this latter part of the nineteenth century, and to observe how law has changed and opinion has altered in regard to marriage, the great foundation of society, and to divorce; and how, almost *pari passu*, various offences against chastity, such as concubinage, prostitution, illegimate births, abortion, disinclination to family life, have increased also—not, indeed, at the same pace everywhere, or all of them equally in all countries, yet have decidedly increased on the whole."‡

Surely in few parts of the wide world is the truth of these strong

* Prof. David Swing in Chicago *Journal.*
† "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Milman's Ed., Vol. III., p. 236.
‡ "Divorce and Divorce Legislation," 2d Ed., p. 274.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words more evident than in those parts of our own country where loose divorce laws have long prevailed.

It should be noted that, while never allowing the dissolution of the marriage bond, the Catholic Church has always permitted, for grave causes and under certain conditions, a temporary or permanent "separation from bed and board." The causes which, *positis ponendis*, justify such separation may be briefly given thus: mutual consent, adultery, and grave peril of soul or body.

It may be said that there are persons so unhappily mated and so constituted that for them no relief can come save from divorce *a vinculo*, with permission to remarry. I shall not linger here to point out to such the need of seeking from a higher than earthly power the grace to suffer and be strong. But for those whose reasoning on this subject is of the earth, earthy, I shall add some words of practical worldly wisdom from eminent jurists. In a note to his edition of Blackstone's "Commentaries," Mr. John Taylor Coleridge says:

"It is no less truly than beautifully said by Sir W. Scott, in the case of Evans *v.* Evans, that 'though in particular cases the repugnance of the law to dissolve the obligation of matrimonial cohabitation may operate with great severity upon individuals, yet it must be carefully remembered that the general happiness of the married life is secured by its indissolubility.' When people understand that they *must* live together, except for a few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften by mutual accommodation that yoke which they know they cannot shake off: they become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives: for necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes. If it were once understood that upon mutual disgust married persons might be legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to their common offspring, and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness, in a state of estrangement from their common offspring, and in a state of the most licentious and unrestrained immorality. In this case, as in many other cases, the happiness of some individuals must be sacrificed to the greater and more general good."

The facility and frequency of divorce, and its lamentable consequences, are nowadays calling much attention to measures of "divorce reform." "How can divorce reform be best secured?" it may be asked. Believing, as I do, that divorce is evil, I also believe that its "reformation" and its death must be simultaneous. It should cease to be. Divorce as we know it began when marriage was removed from the domain of the church: divorce shall cease when the old order shall be restored. Will this ever come to pass? Perhaps so—after many days. Meanwhile, something might be done, something should be done, to lessen the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evils of divorce. Our present divorce legislation must be presumed to be such as the majority of the people wish it. A first step, therefore, in the way of "divorce reform" should be the creation of a more healthy public sentiment on this question. Then will follow measures that will do good in proportion to their stringency. A few practical suggestions as to the salient features of remedial divorce legislation may not be out of place. Persons seeking at the hands of the civil law relief in matrimonial troubles should have the right to ask for divorce *a vinculo*, or simple separation *a mensâ et thoro*, as they may elect. The number of legally-recognized grounds for divorce should be lessened, and "noiseless" divorces forbidden. "Rapid-transit" facilities for passing through divorce courts should be cut off, and divorce "agencies" should be suppressed. The plaintiff in a divorce case should be a *bona-fide* resident of the judicial district in which his petition is filed, and in every divorce case the legal representatives of the State should appear for the defendant, and, by all means, the right of remarriage after divorce should be restricted. If divorce cannot be legislated out of existence, let, at least, its power for evil be diminished.

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS.

I AM asked certain questions with regard to the attitude of the Episcopal Church towards the matter of divorce. In undertaking to answer them, it is to be remembered that there is a considerable variety of opinion which is held in more or less precise conformity with doctrinal or canonical declarations of the church. With these variations this paper, except in so far as it may briefly indicate them, is not concerned. Nor is it an expression of individual opinion. That is not what has been asked for or attempted.

The doctrine and law of the Protestant Episcopal Church on the subject of divorce is contained in canon 13, title II., of the "Digest of the Canons," 1887. That canon has been to a certain extent interpreted by Episcopal judgments under section IV. The "public opinion" of the clergy or laity can only be ascertained in the usual way; especially by examining their published treatises, letters, etc., and perhaps most satisfactorily by the reports of discussion in the diocesan and general conventions on the subject of divorce. Among members of the Protestant Episcopal Church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divorce is excessively rare, cases of uncertainty in the application of the canon are much more rare, and the practice of the clergy is almost perfectly uniform. There is, however, by no means the same uniformity in their opinions either as to divorce or marriage.

As divorce is necessarily a mere accident of marriage, and as divorce is impossible without a precedent marriage, much practical difficulty might arise, and much difference of opinion does arise, from the fact that the Protestant Episcopal Church has nowhere defined marriage. Negatively, it is explicitly affirmed (Article XXV.) that "matrimony is not to be counted for a sacrament of the Gospel." This might seem to reduce matrimony to a civil contract. And accordingly the first rubric in the *Form of Solemnization of Matrimony* directs, on the ground of differences of laws in the various States, that "the minister is left to the direction of those laws in everything that regards the civil contract between the parties." Laws determining what persons shall be capable of contracting would seem to be included in "everything that regards the civil contract"; and unquestionably the laws of most of the States render all persons legally divorced capable of at once contracting a new marriage. Both the first section of canon 13 and the *Form of Solemnization*, affirm that, "if any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful." But it is nowhere, excepting as to divorce, declared *what the impediments are*. The Protestant Episcopal Church has never, by canon or express legislation, published, for instance, a table of prohibited degrees.

On the matter of divorce, however, canon 13, title II., supersedes, for the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, both a part of the civil law relating to the persons capable of contracting marriage, and also all private judgment as to the teaching of "the Word of God" on that subject. No minister is allowed, as a rule, to solemnize the marriage of any man or woman who has a divorced husband or wife still living. But if the person seeking to be married is the innocent party in the divorce for adultery, that person, whether man or woman, may be married by a minister of the church. With the above exception, the clergy are forbidden to administer the sacraments to any divorced and remarried person without the express permission of the bishop, unless that person be "penitent" and "in imminent danger of death." Any doubts "as to the facts of any case under section II.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this canon" must be referred to the bishop. Of course, where there is no reasonable doubt the minister may proceed. It may be added that the sacraments are to be refused also to persons who may be reasonably supposed to have contracted marriage "otherwise," in any respect, "than as the Word of God and the discipline of this church doth allow." These impediments are nowhere defined; and accordingly it has happened that a man who had married a deceased wife's sister and the woman he had married were, by the private judgment of a priest, refused the holy communion. The civil courts do not seem inclined to protect the clergy from consequences of interference with the civil law. In Southbridge, Mass., a few weeks ago, a man who had been denounced from the altar for marrying again after a divorce obtained a judgment for $1,720 damages. The law of the church would seem to be that, even though a legal divorce may have been obtained, remarriage is absolutely forbidden, excepting to the innocent party, whether man or woman, in a divorce for adultery. The penalty for breach of this law might involve, for the officiating clergyman, deposition from the ministry; for the offending man or woman, exclusion from the sacraments, which, in the judgment of a very large number of the clergy, involves everlasting damnation.

It is obvious, then, that the Protestant Episcopal Church allows the complete validity of a divorce *a vinculo* in the case of adultery, and the right of remarriage to the innocent party. But that church has not determined in what manner either the grounds of the divorce or the "innocence" of either party is to be ascertained. The canon does not require a clergyman to demand, nor can the church enable him to secure, the production of a copy of the record or decree of the court of law by which a divorce is granted, nor would such decree indicate the "innocence" of one party, though it might prove the guilt of the other.

The effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family is too obvious to require stating. As the father and mother are the heads of the family, their separation must inevitably destroy the common family life. On the other hand, it is often contended that the destruction has been already completed, and that a divorce is only the legal recognition of what has already taken place; "the integrity of the family" can scarcely remain when either a father or mother, or both, are living in violation of the law on which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that integrity rests. The question may be asked whether the absolute prohibition of divorce would contribute to the moral purity of society. It is difficult to answer such a question, because anything on the subject must be comparatively worthless until verified by experience. It is quite certain that the prohibition of divorce never prevents illicit sexual connections, as was abundantly proved when divorce in England was put within the reach of persons who were not able to afford the expense of a special act of Parliament. It is, indeed, so palpable a fact that any amount of evidence or argument is wholly superfluous.

The *law* of the Protestant Episcopal Church is by no means identical with the opinion of either the clergy or the laity. In the judgment of many, the existing law is far too lax, or, at least, the whole doctrine of marriage is far too inadequately dealt with in the authoritative teaching of the church. The opinion of this school finds, perhaps, its most adequate expression in the report of a committee of the last General Convention forming Appendix XIII. of the "Journal" of that convention. It is, substantially, that the Mosaic law of marriage is still binding upon the church, unless directly abrogated by Christ himself; that it was abrogated by him only so far that all divorce was forbidden by him, excepting for the cause of fornication; that a woman might not claim divorce for any reason whatever; that the marriage of a divorced person until the death of the other party is wholly forbidden; that marriage is not merely a civil contract, but a spiritual and supernatural union, requiring for its mutual obligation a supernatural, divine grace; that such grace is only imparted in the sacrament of matrimony, which is a true sacrament and does actually confer grace; that marriage is wholly within the jurisdiction of the church, though the State may determine such rules and guarantees as may secure publicity and sufficient evidence of a marriage, etc.; that severe penalties should be inflicted by the State, on the demand of the church, for the suppression of all offences against the seventh commandment and sundry other parts of the Mosaic legislation, especially in relation to "prohibited degrees."

There is another school, equally earnest and sincere in its zeal for the integrity of the family and sexual purity, which would nevertheless repudiate much the greater part of the above assumption. This school, if one may so venture to combine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scattered opinions, argues substantially as follows: The type of all Mosaic legislation was circumcision; that rite was of universal obligation and divine authority. St. Paul so regarded it. The abrogation of the law requiring circumcision was, therefore, the abrogation of the whole of the Mosaic legislation. The "burden of proof," therefore, rests upon those who affirm the present obligation of what formed a part of the Mosaic law; and they must show that it has been reënacted by Christ and his Apostles or forms some part of some other and independent system of law or morals still in force. Christ's words about divorce are not to be construed as a positive law, but as expressing the ideal of marriage, and corresponding to his words about eunuchs, which not everybody "can receive." So far as Christ's words seem to indicate an inequality as to divorce between man and woman, they are explained by the authoritative and inspired assertion of St. Paul: "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." A divine law is equally authoritative by whomsoever declared—whether by the Son Incarnate or by the Holy Ghost speaking through inspired Apostles. If, then, a divine law was ever capable of suspension or modification, it may still be capable of such suspension or modification in corresponding circumstances. The circumstances which justified a modification of the original divine law of marriage do still exist in many conditions of society and even of individual life. The Protestant Episcopal Church cannot, alone, speak with such authority on disputed passages of Scripture as to justify her ministers in direct disobedience to the civil authority, which is also "ordained of God." The exegesis of the early church was closely connected with theories about matter, and about the inferiority of women and of married life, which are no longer believed.

Of course this is a very brief statement. As a matter of fact the actual effect of the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church on marriage and divorce is that divorce among her members is excessively rare; that it is regarded with extreme aversion; and that the public opinion of the church maintains the law as it now is, but could not be trusted to execute laws more stringent. A member of the committee of the General Convention whose report has been already referred to closes that report with the following protest:

"The undersigned finds himself unable to concur in so much of the [proposed] canon as forbids the holy communion to a truly pious and godly woman who has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compelled by long years of suffering from a drunken and brutal husband to obtain a divorce, and has regularly married some suitable person according to the established laws of the land. And also from so much of the [proposed] canon as may seem to forbid marriage with a deceased wife's sister."

The final action on these points, which has already been stated, indicates that the proposed report thus referred to was, in one particular at least, in advance of the sentiment of the church as expressed in her General Convention.

HENRY C. POTTER.

Question (1). *Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?*

THE world for the most part is ruled by the tomb, and the living are tyrannized over by the dead. Old ideas, long after the conditions under which they were produced have passed away, often persist in surviving. Many are disposed to worship the ancient—to follow the old paths, without inquiring where they lead, and without knowing exactly where they wish to go themselves.

Opinions on the subject of divorce have been for the most part inherited from the early Christians. They have come down to us through theological and priestly channels. The early Christians believed that the world was about to be destroyed, or that it was to be purified by fire; that all the wicked were to perish, and that the good were to be caught up in the air to meet their Lord—to remain there, in all probability, until the earth was prepared as a habitation for the blessed. With this thought or belief in their minds, the things of this world were of comparatively no importance. The man who built larger barns in which to store his grain was regarded as a foolish farmer, who had forgotten, in his greed for gain, the value of his own soul. They regarded prosperous people as the children of Mammon, and the unfortunate, the wretched and diseased, as the favorites of God. They discouraged all worldly pursuits, except the soliciting of alms. There was no time to marry or to be given in marriage; no time to build homes and have families. All their thoughts were centred upon the heaven they expected to inherit. Business, love, all secular things, fell into disrepute.

Nothing is said in the Testament about the families of the Apostles; nothing of family life, of the sacredness of home;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing about the necessity of education, the improvement and development of the mind. These things were forgotten, for the reason that nothing, in the presence of the expected event, was considered of any importance, except to be ready when the Son of Man should come. Such was the feeling, that rewards were offered by Christ himself to those who would desert their wives and children. Human love was spoken of with contempt. "Let the dead bury their dead. What is that to thee? Follow thou me." They not only believed these things, but acted in accordance with them; and, as a consequence, all the relations of life were denied or avoided, and their obligations disregarded. Marriage was discouraged. It was regarded as only one degree above open and unbridled vice, and was allowed only in consideration of human weakness. It was thought far better not to marry—that it was something grander for a man to love God than to love woman. The exceedingly godly, the really spiritual, believed in celibacy, and held the opposite sex in a kind of pious abhorrence. And yet, with that inconsistency so characteristic of theologians, marriage was held to be a sacrament. The priest said to the man who married: "Remember that you are caught for life. This door opens but once. Before this den of matrimony the tracks are all one way." This was in the nature of a punishment for having married. The theologian felt that the contract of marriage, if not contrary to God's command, was at least contrary to his advice, and that the married ought to suffer in some way, as a matter of justice. The fact that there could be no divorce, that a mistake could not be corrected, was held up as a warning. At every wedding-feast this skeleton stretched its fleshless finger towards bride and groom.

Nearly all intelligent people have given up the idea that the world is about to come to an end. They do not now believe that prosperity is a certain sign of wickedness, or that poverty and wretchedness are sure certificates of virtue. They are hardly convinced that Dives should have been sent to hell simply for being rich, or that Lazarus was entitled to eternal joy on account of his poverty. We now know that prosperous people may be good, and that unfortunate people may be bad. We have reached the conclusion that the practice of virtue tends in the direction of prosperity, and that a violation of the conditions of well-being brings, with absolute certainty, wretchedness and misfortune.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was a time when it was believed that the sin of an individual was visited upon the tribe, the community, or the nation to which he belonged. It was then thought that if a man or woman had made a vow to God, and had failed to keep the vow, God might punish the entire community; therefore it was the business of the community to see to it that the vow was kept. That idea has been abandoned. As we progress, the rights of the individual are perceived, and we are now beginning dimly to discern that there are no rights higher than the rights of the individual. There was a time when nearly all believed in the reforming power of punishment—in the beneficence of brute force. But the world is changing. It was at one time thought that the Inquisition was the saviour of society; that the persecution of the philosopher was requisite to the preservation of the state, and that, no matter what happened, the state should be preserved. We have now more light. And standing upon this luminous point that we call the present, let me answer your questions.

Marriage is the most important, the most sacred, contract that human beings can make. No matter whether we call it a contract, or a sacrament, or both, it remains precisely the same. And no matter whether this contract is entered into in the presence of magistrate or priest, it is exactly the same. A true marriage is a natural concord and agreement of souls, a harmony in which discord is not even imagined; it is a mingling so perfect that only one seems to exist; all other considerations are lost; the present seems to be eternal. In this supreme moment there is no shadow—or the shadow is as luminous as light. And when two beings thus love, thus unite, this is the true marriage of soul and soul. That which is said before the altar, or minister, or magistrate, or in the presence of witnesses, is only the outward evidence of that which has already happened within; it simply testifies to a union that has already taken place—to the uniting of two mornings that hope to reach the night together. Each has found the ideal: the man has found the one woman of all the world—the impersonation of affection, purity, passion, love, beauty, and grace; and the woman has found the one man of all the world, her ideal, and all that she knows of romance, of art, courage, heroism, honesty, is realized in him. The idea of contract is lost. Duty and obligation are instantly changed into desire and joy, and two lives, like uniting streams, flow on as one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nothing can add to the sacredness of this marriage, to the obligation and duty of each to each. There is nothing in the ceremony except the desire on the part of the man and woman that the whole world should know that they are really married and that their souls have been united.

Every marriage, for a thousand reasons, should be public, should be recorded, should be known; but, above all, to the end that the purity of the union should appear. These ceremonies are not only for the good and for the protection of the married, but also for the protection of their children, and of society as well. But, after all, the marriage remains a contract of the highest possible character—a contract in which each gives and receives a heart.

The question then arises, Should this marriage, under any circumstances, be dissolved? It is easy to understand the position taken by the various churches; but back of theological opinions is the question of contract.

In this contract of marriage, the man agrees to protect and cherish his wife. Suppose that he refuses to protect; that he abuses, assaults, and tramples upon the woman he wed. What is her redress? Is she under any obligation to him? He has violated the contract. He has failed to protect, and, in addition, he has assaulted her like a wild beast. Is she under any obligation to him? Is she bound by the contract he has broken? If so, what is the consideration for this obligation? Must she live with him for his sake? or, if she leaves him to preserve her life, must she remain his wife for his sake? No intelligent man will answer these questions in the affirmative.

If, then, she is not bound to remain his wife for the husband's sake, is she bound to remain his wife because the marriage was a sacrament? Is there any obligation on the part of the wife to remain with the brutal husband for the sake of God? Can her conduct affect in any way the happiness of an infinite being? Is it possible for a human being to increase or diminish the well-being of the Infinite?

The next question is as to the right of society in this matter. It must be admitted that the peace of society will be promoted by the separation of such people. Certainly society cannot insist upon a wife remaining with a husband who bruises and mangles her flesh. Even married women have a right to personal security. They do not lose, either by contract or sacrament, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right of self-preservation; this they share in common, to say the least of it, with the lowest living creatures.

This will probably be admitted by most of the enemies of divorce; but they will insist that while the wife has the right to flee from her husband's roof and seek protection of kindred or friends, the marriage—the sacrament—must remain unbroken. Is it to the interest of society that those who despise each other should live together? Ought the world to be peopled by the children of hatred or disgust, the children of lust and loathing, or by the welcome babes of mutual love? Is it possible that an infinitely wise and compassionate God insists that a helpless woman shall remain the wife of a cruel wretch? Can this add to the joy of Paradise, or tend to keep one harp in tune? Can anything be more infamous than for a government to compel a woman to remain the wife of a man she hates—of one whom she justly holds in abhorrence? Does any decent man wish the assistance of a constable, a sheriff, a judge, or a church, to keep his wife in his house? Is it possible to conceive of a more contemptible human being than a man who would appeal to force in such a case? It may be said that the woman is free to go, and that the courts will protect her from the brutality of the man who promised to be her protector; but where shall the woman go? She may have no friends; or they may be poor; her kindred may be dead. Has she no right to build another home? Must this woman, full of kindness, affection, health, be tied and chained to this living corpse? Is there no future for her? Must she be an outcast forever—deceived and betrayed for her whole life? Can she never sit by her own hearth, with the arms of her children about her neck, and with a husband who loves and protects her? Is she to become a social pariah, and is this for the benefit of society?—or is it for the sake of the wretch who destroyed her life?

The ground has been taken that woman would lose her dignity if marriage could be annulled. Is it necessary to lose your liberty in order to retain your moral character—in order to be pure and womanly? Must a woman, in order to retain her virtue, become a slave, a serf, with a beast for a master, or with society for a master, or with a phantom for a master?

If an infinite being is one of the parties to the contract, is it not the duty of this being to see to it that the contract is carried

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out? What consideration does the infinite being give? What consideration does he receive? If a wife owes no duty to her husband because the husband has violated the contract, and has even assaulted her life, is it possible for her to feel toward him any real thrill of affection? If she does not, what is there left of marriage? What part of this contract or sacrament remains in living force? She can not sustain the relation of wife, because she abhors him; she can not remain under the same roof, for fear that she may be killed. They sustain, then, only the relations of hunter and hunted—of tyrant and victim. Is it desirable that this relation should last through life, and that it should be rendered sacred by the ceremony of a church?

Again I ask, Is it desirable to have families raised under such circumstances? Are we in need of children born of such parents? Can the virtue of others be preserved only by this destruction of happiness, by this perpetual imprisonment?

A marriage without love is bad enough, and a marriage for wealth or position is low enough; but what shall we say of a marriage where the parties actually abhor each other? Is there any morality in this? any virtue in this? Is there virtue in retaining the name of wife, or husband, without the real and true relation? Will any good man say, will any good woman declare, that a true, loving woman should be compelled to be the mother of children whose father she detests? Is there a good woman in the world who would not shrink from this herself; and is there a woman so heartless and so immoral that she would force another to bear that from which she would shudderingly and shriekingly shrink?

Marriages are made by men and women; not by society; not by the state; not by the church; not by supernatural beings. By this time we should know that nothing is moral that does not tend to the well-being of sentient beings; that nothing is virtuous the result of which is not good. We know now, if we know anything, that all the reasons for doing right, and all the reasons against doing wrong, are here in this world. We should have imagination enough to put ourselves in the place of another. Let a man suppose himself a helpless woman beaten by a brutal husband—would he advocate divorces then?

Few people have an adequate idea of the sufferings of women and children, of the number of wives who tremble when they hear the footsteps of a returning husband, of the number of chil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dren who hide when they hear the voice of a father. Few people know the number of blows that fall on the flesh of the helpless every day, and few know the nights of terror passed by mothers who hold babes to their breasts. Compared with these, all the hardships of poverty borne by those who love each other are as nothing. Men and women truly married bear the sufferings and misfortunes of poverty together. They console each other. In the darkest night they see the radiance of a star, and their affection gives to the heart of each perpetual sunshine.

The good home is the unit of the good government. The hearth-stone is the corner-stone of civilization. Society is not interested in the preservation of hateful homes, of homes where husbands and wives are selfish, cold, and cruel. It is not to the interest of society that good women should be enslaved, that they should live in fear, or that they should become mothers by husbands whom they hate. Homes should be filled with kind and generous fathers, with true and loving mothers; and when they are so filled, the world will be civilized. Intelligence will rock the cradle; justice will sit in the courts; wisdom in the legislative halls; and above all and over all, like the dome of heaven, will be the spirit of liberty.

Although marriage is the most important and the most sacred contract that human beings can make, still when that contract has been violated, courts should have the power to declare it null and void upon such conditions as may be just.

As a rule, the woman dowers the husband with her youth, her beauty, her love—with all she has; and from this contract certainly the husband should never be released, unless the wife has broken the conditions of that contract. Divorces should be granted publicly, precisely as the marriage should be solemnized. Every marriage should be known, and there should be witnesses, to the end that the character of the contract entered into should be understood; the record should be open and public. And the same is true of divorces. The conditions should be determined, the property should be divided by a court of equity, and the custody of the children given under regulations prescribed.

Men and women are not virtuous by law. Law does not of itself create virtue, nor is it the foundation or fountain of love Law should protect virtue, and law should protect the wife, if she has kept her contract, and the husband, if he has fulfilled his. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the death of love is the end of marriage. Love is natural. Back of all ceremony burns and will forever burn the sacred flame. There has been no time in the world's history when that torch was extinguished. In all ages, in all climes, among all people, there has been true, pure, and unselfish love. Long before a ceremony was thought of, long before a priest existed, there were true and perfect marriages. Back of public opinion is natural modesty, the affections of the heart; and in spite of all law, there is and forever will be the realm of choice. Wherever love is, it is pure; and everywhere, and at all times, the ceremony of marriage testifies to that which has happened within the temple of the human heart.

Question (2). *Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?*

This depends upon whether marriage is a crime. If it is not a crime, why should any penalty be attached? Can any one conceive of any reason why a woman obtaining a divorce, without fault on her part, should be compelled as a punishment to remain forever single? Why should she be punished for the dishonesty or brutality of another? Why should a man who faithfully kept his contract of marriage, and who was deserted by an unfaithful wife, be punished for the benefit of society? Why should he be doomed to live without a home?

There is still another view. We must remember that human passions are the same after as before divorce. To prevent remarriage is to give excuse for vice.

Question (3). *What is the effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family?*

The real marriage is back of the ceremony, and the real divorce is back of the decree. When love is dead, when husband and wife abhor each other, they are divorced. The decree records in a judicial way what has really taken place, just as the ceremony of marriage attests a contract already made.

The true family is the result of the true marriage, and the institution of the family should above all things be preserved. What becomes of the sacredness of the home, if the law compels those who abhor each other to sit at the same hearth? This lowers the standard, and changes the happy haven of home into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prison-cell. If we wish to preserve the integrity of the family, we must preserve the democracy of the fireside, the republicanism of the home, the absolute and perfect equality of husband and wife. There must be no exhibition of force, no spectre of fear. The mother must not remain through an order of court, or the command of a priest, or by virtue of the tyranny of society; she must sit in absolute freedom, the queen of herself, the sovereign of her own soul and of her own body. Real homes can never be preserved through force, through slavery, or superstition. Nothing can be more sacred than a home, no altar purer than the hearth.

Question (4). *Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?*

We must define our terms. What is moral purity? The intelligent of this world seek the well-being of themselves and others. They know that happiness is the only good; and this they strive to attain. To live in accordance with the conditions of well-being is moral in the highest sense. To use the best instrumentalities to attain the highest ends is our highest conception of the moral. In other words, morality is the melody or the perfection of conduct. A man is not moral because he is obedient through fear or ignorance. Morality lives in the realm of perceived obligation, and where a being acts in accordance with perceived obligation, that being is moral. Morality is not the child of slavery. Ignorance is not the corner-stone of virtue.

The first duty of a human being is to himself. He must see to it that he does not become a burden upon others. To be self-respecting, he must endeavor to be self-sustaining. If by his industry and intelligence he accumulates a margin, then he is under obligation to do with that margin all the good he can. He who lives to the ideal does the best he can. In true marriage men and women give not only their bodies, but their souls. This is the ideal marriage; this is moral. They who give their bodies, but not their souls, are not married, whatever the ceremony may be; this is immoral.

If this be true, upon what principle can a woman continue to sustain the relation of wife after love is dead? Is there some other consideration that can take the place of genuine affection? Can she be bribed with money, or a home, or position, or by public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion, and still remain a virtuous woman? Is it for the good of society that virtue should be thus crucified between church and state? Can it be said that this contributes to the moral purity of the human race?

Is there a higher standard of virtue in countries where divorce is prohibited than in those where it is granted? Where husbands and wives who have ceased to love cannot be divorced, there are mistresses and lovers.

The sacramental view of marriage is the shield of vice. The world looks at the wife who has been abused, who has been driven from the home of her husband, and the world pities; and when this wife is loved by some other man, the world excuses. So, too, the husband who cannot live in peace, who leaves his home, is pitied and excused.

Is it possible to conceive of anything more immoral than for a husband to insist on living with a wife who has no love for him? Is not this a perpetual crime? Is the wife to lose her personality? Has she no right of choice? Is her modesty the property of another? Is the man she hates the lord of her desire? Has she no right to guard the jewels of her soul? Is there a depth below this? And is this the foundation of morality? this the corner-stone of society? this the arch that supports the dome of civilization? Is this pathetic sacrifice on the one hand, this sacrilege on the other, pleasing in the sight of heaven?

To me, the tenderest word in our language, the most pathetic fact within our knowledge, is maternity. Around this sacred word cluster the joys and sorrows, the agonies and ecstasies, of the human race. The mother walks in the shadow of death that she may give another life. Upon the altar of love she puts her own life in pawn. When the world is civilized, no wife will become a mother against her will. Man will then know that to enslave another is to imprison himself.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOPES OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

BY THE HON. GEORGE G. VEST, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MISSOURI.

It is not possible to anticipate the contingencies which may confront any political party in a country with so large an area as ours, where new interests and consequently new antagonisms are constantly being developed, and where suffrage, often lashed to fury by prejudice and passion, or corrupted in many localities by money or patronage, determines the issue. An accident not contemplated, a crisis unprovided for, may, of course, wreck for a time the fortunes of any party, but we are not necessarily left to conjecture as to the ultimate effect of such misfortune. Political parties have great distinctive characteristics, which run through the web and woof of their organization, as in races, communities, and individuals; and before forming an intelligent opinion as to their reasonable hopes of future success, their history and antecedents must be carefully analyzed. To assume that party management and the clamor of campaign warfare have made or unmade political parties in this country is to overlook the fact that, as a people, whatever may have been the differences of opinion on public questions, we have, by heredity and education, a deep, overruling love of liberty,—not of liberty in the abstract, posing as a goddess before the maddened populace of Paris, but that real, substantial liberty, which gives to every citizen governmental protection and imposes upon him a just share of the taxation necessary to support the government.

A careful analysis of our history will show that underneath the current of political events, disturbed as it has often been by sectional and economic antagonisms, this gulf-stream of love by the people for personal and public liberty has at last swept party organizations to success or defeat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is true that in 1840 and 1848 the glamour of military glory seems to have elevated to the Presidency candidates without other claims than their successful command of armies, but in 1852 the experiment signally failed, and the most distinguished soldier of the Republic was overwhelmingly defeated. Nor must it be overlooked that the election of Harrison in 1840 resulted largely from a conviction in the popular mind that the governmental patronage was being used by the leaders of the party which had controlled the country during thirty-six years, for private and partisan purposes without regard to the public good; and to rebuke these abuses, rather than to pass upon party policy or principles, was the object of voters. And so in 1848 the election of Taylor came from the belief that he had been treated unjustly by the powers at Washington during the Mexican War, and sympathy for a gallant soldier, who had won a great victory at Buena Vista against overwhelming odds, and in spite of his enemies at the national capital, bore him into the Presidential chair. It may well be said that in both of these instances the love of liberty, or of fair play and equal rights, as opposed to governmental favoritism and oppression, controlled popular action.

The first great party of the country was overthrown upon the distinct issue that it had championed the centralizing doctrines of Alexander Hamilton and the Alien and Sedition laws which violated personal liberty. The election of Jefferson over John Adams in 1800 was a rebuke to the advocates of centralization from which they did not recover, and the Federalists as a party existed only upon the pages of history until revived in the present Republican organization, their lineal political offspring. It is impossible to conclude that the absolute destruction of the Federal party and the continuous supremacy of the Democrats for nearly forty years were the result of superior leadership or campaign management. Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, John Adams, and Gouverneur Morris were men of commanding ability, and Washington himself was not unfriendly to their principles. He believed, with many other patriotic men, that only a strong government could long exist, and he was shocked by the excesses of the French Revolution into doubts as to a purely democratic system. There can be no question that, while he did not favor the monarchical doctrines of Hamilton, who believed the English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government the best ever invented, Washington was induced by his great personal regard for that statesman to look kindly upon the party of which Hamilton was the leader.

In addition to able leadership, the Federalists possessed largely the wealth and social influence of the new Republic, then concentrated in the cities of New York and Philadelphia. Jefferson tells us that upon his return from France, when he became Secretary of State, he found the *élite* of fashionable society in favor of monarchy, and that at dinner parties there were none to defend republican institutions except a few members of the two houses of Congress. To be a Democrat was to invite the suspicion of socialism in its worse form, and Jefferson himself was assailed as a Jacobin, imbued with all the tenets of the French Revolutionists.

It is not strange that with Jefferson as Secretary of State and Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury there should have been discord in Washington's Cabinet. It culminated in the latter giving up his portfolio and retiring to Monticello. When Hamilton sent to Congress his Report on Manufactures, in which he enunciated the doctrine that Congress could impose any import duties deemed necessary in order to encourage and protect American manufactures and thereby promote the general welfare, Jefferson denounced the report, and stated to the President that it amounted to Congressional absolutism, and was in violation of the Constitution. He declared that the government was one of limited powers, and if Congress could impose duties without other limitation than their judgment of what was necessary for the general welfare, we had fought the Revolutionary War in vain, and had gone back to the worst phase of centralization. Here was the beginning of that bitter contest between the Federal and Democratic parties which destroyed the former and elected Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson to the Presidency.

Opponents of the Democratic party often assert that Jefferson favored import duties for the protection of American industries and that Madison voted in the first Congress under the Constitution for a tariff bill having this object. There is no doubt that both these great statesmen were anxious to foster domestic enterprise, then so much needed, and to secure complete independence, especially of England, from whose thraldom we had just escaped; but it is an outrage upon their fame to assert that either of them ever advanced the idea that duties could or should be imposed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without regard to the amount necessary to support the government, and limited only by the discretion of Congress. Jefferson strongly denounced the doctrine, and the tariff law passed by the first Congress, and so often quoted, expressly stated in its title that it was enacted to raise money for the support of the government and to encourage American industries.

It is not possible for any intelligent man, unless blinded by partisan zeal, to believe that Jefferson, the life-long defender of the doctrine that all citizens should share equally in the benefits and burdens of the government, the uncompromising foe of class legislation and special privilege, and Madison, his chosen friend and successor, Father of the Constitution and expounder of its limitations, ever favored, or would now favor, if living, the monstrous system under which the infant industries of 1800 have become the overgrown frauds of to-day.

No other conclusion can be reached by the impartial mind than that the Democratic party succeeded in destroying its great rival, and in holding the government for nearly forty years, because the American people believed it to be the friend of equal rights and the foe of all laws which create a partnership between the government and certain classes, by which enormous profits are secured to the latter at the expense of other citizens. This was the evil denounced by Andrew Jackson in his message vetoing the bill establishing the United States Bank, and it is the monstrous evil which confronts us now in the existing tariff system advocated by the party in power.

If a great leader and intelligent membership were all the requisites for success, the Whig party led by Henry Clay, the most eloquent and magnetic of our public men, and having in its ranks conservative and thoughtful voters in every part of the Union, ought to have survived the defeat of 1852. Mr. Clay was the ablest advocate of the protection doctrine it has ever had, and, whilst he avoided the extreme position now held by the Republicans, he clothed the dogma with all the charms of oratory, and gave it the name of the "American system." But neither oratory nor nomenclature availed. The Whig party, great and patriotic, could not touch the heart of the American people. It had a flavor of the old Federalists and, although eminently respectable, inspired no popular affection or confidence. After the defeat of General Scott for the Presidency,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Whig organization disintegrated, a majority of its members in the Northern States joining the Republicans, and those in the Southern and Middle States allying themselves to the Democrats or to the American, or Know-nothing, party, which was wrecked in the brief space of two years by its fatal tenets of oath-bound secrecy and religious proscription.

The Democratic party then found itself face to face with an adversary far more dangerous than all its old enemies combined. Young, vigorous, enthusiastic, the Republican party gathered under a banner having for its inscription an irresistible appeal to the great heart of the American people—"Liberty to All." African slavery, for the existence of which both sections were responsible, had been imbedded in the Constitution and laws, while it was inextricably twined about the social and industrial life of the people in fifteen States of the Union. No compromise was possible, for debate only aroused passion, and the institution, protected by constitutional and statutory laws, could only be uprooted by the ploughshare of war. It was done amidst tears and blood and all the horrors of internecine strife. Democrats were upon both sides bravely fighting for the right as they saw it, but for not one instant did the party cease to exist or its flag disappear.

No more conspicuous illustration of the overruling love of the American people for liberty can be imagined than the effect upon the Democratic party of its apparent opposition to human freedom. For the first time in its history, this great organization, which had governed the country almost without interruption for sixty years, met with disaster from the irresistible logic of events. That it was not, as a party, the advocate or defender of African slavery can be seen in the fact that Jefferson and all the great Democratic leaders were opposed to the institution. The first public act of Jefferson's life was to propose in the Virginia House of Burgesses a bill providing for the gradual emancipation of slaves, and in the Ordinance of 1787 he wrote the clause declaring that in the territory ceded by Virginia to the Union "slavery and involuntary servitude is hereby forever prohibited, except in punishment for crime of which the party shall be duly convicted." The culture of cotton in the Southern States having largely increased the value of African slaves, the owners, recognizing that the prejudices of the civilized world were arrayed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against them, naturally looked to the provisions of the Constitution for protection to their property. In the Democratic party, pledged by its history and principles to a strict construction of that instrument and the faithful observance of all its guarantees, they saw the only safeguard; and it followed, therefore, that the slavery agitation found a large majority of voters in the Southern States members of the Democratic party. That the party has survived the charge, unjustly, but plausibly, made, of defending slavery is proof of its inherent vitality.

With the war perished forever African slavery upon this continent, leaving the Republican party in absolute control of the government. If a wise and generous policy had then marked its course, this control might have been indefinitely protracted; but hardly had the sound of cannon and musketry died away before the features of the old Federalists appeared in their offspring, and violence in the place of conciliation, partisan greed rather than statesmanship, governed the party leaders. Instead of assisting the conquered South to reëstablish its broken fortunes and rebuild its ruined homes, the first step of the ruling party was to inaugurate what was called "reconstruction," or, in truth, "redestruction," under which a remorseless and rapacious horde of plunderers was turned loose upon an almost hopeless people. Instead of removing the war taxes upon the necessaries of life so as to relieve the poor, the taxes upon banks, railroads, manufactures, and incomes were taken off the rich, but remain to this day upon that portion of the people who are least able to pay them. Instead of creating a cheap and abundant circulating medium, it has been the constant endeavor of the Republicans to destroy silver and make gold the only standard. The bonds of the government payable in coin were made payable in gold, and this was followed by legislation striking the silver dollar from our coinage, and the declaration by Republican statesmen that silver should be used only as subsidiary coin.

For a time the logical result of the war was to place the Republican party in unquestioned supremacy; but as the passions of that bloody strife are gradually being allayed, and the hereditary principles and tendencies of the two great parties are again coming to view, the hopes of the Democratic party are each year brighter. Again will the American people turn to the party which has always defended the limitations and guarantees of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitution, and deny their confidence to the political organization which has used the sacred name of freedom for party purposes only, and has not scrupled to debauch the suffrage, when that suffrage should be the stronghold of liberty.

In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden and in 1884 Grover Cleveland were elected to the Presidency, and at the election of 1888 a majority of the popular vote was cast for the Democratic over the Republican candidate. Is this the result of leadership, or management, or corruption? Or is it because the Democratic party has been in its long and eventful history, with all its blunders and misfortunes, the friend of popular government, and the inveterate foe of class legislation and monopolized plunder?

We have an abiding hope that the prejudices arising from civil war will disappear, and that a free people. unbought by the money of subsidized interests and uninfluenced by the appeal of demagogues, will examine dispassionately the great issue between the Republican and Democratic parties, and determine from history and argument on which side are the traditions and safeguards of free institutions.

What is this issue? It is that upon which Jefferson defeated John Adams in 1800, and which was formulated in the Report on Manufactures by Alexander Hamilton: that Congress has the power, in order to promote the general welfare, to levy such import duties as it may think necessary. In every platform of the Republican party prior to 1888 it was declared that tariff duties should be imposed sufficient to support the government, and so adjusted as to encourage American industries. The convention which nominated President Harrison at Chicago threw aside all disguise, and declared for a tariff to protect American industries without regard to revenue. This is the issue, and upon it we hope to overthrow the Republicans as signally and completely as their political progenitors were overthrown by Jefferson in 1800.

Free trade is not an issue, whatever may be the opinions of individuals, for no political party advocates it. When Mr. Cleveland honestly and bravely said to Congress that there should be a reduction of import duties, such as would relieve the taxpayer without injuring the protected interests, and pointed out how this could be done, he was assailed as a Free-Trader in order to alarm the manufacturers and obtain the campaign fund neces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sary to purchase the floating vote in "blocks of five." This was "a good-enough Morgan" until after the election, and served the purpose of filling Senator Quay's contribution-box and putting Mr. Wanamaker in the Cabinet; but the leaders of the Republican party knew the charge to be false.

What we hope to place squarely before the people o the United States is the real question at issue—"Whether import duties shall be imposed for protection without regard to necessary revenue, or only such amount of duties as may be required to pay the expenses of government, so adjusted as to relieve from taxation the necessaries of life and at the same time encourage American manufactures." This question was not determined by the last Presidential election. Mr. Cleveland was defeated by the enormous expenditure of money extorted from the fears of the protected classes, and by the untiring efforts of the Grand Army of the Republic, whose enmity he had aroused by his brave and patriotic opposition to the wholesale system of pension robbery of which the late Commissioner Tanner has been so able an exponent. In the manufacturing States of New Jersey and Connecticut the Democrats were successful, whilst in the great military States of the Northwest, which had furnished the soldiers who conquered the South, but where there were few manufacturing establishments, they were defeated. In their steady and unswerving adherence to the course marked out in the tariff message of Mr. Cleveland is the great hope of the Democracy. "One swallow does not make a summer," and one repulse does not make disaster permanent. The truths announced in that message will prevail, and to falter in their defence is to invite defeat.

If fresh arguments are needed to prove that the position of the Republican party is untenable, and that its success can only be purchased, they are found in the present condition of Harrison's administration. It is as absolutely the property of the protected manufacturers and the Grand Army of the Republic as if the title-papers had been delivered and put to record. During the last canvass the people were promised that the import duties imposed by the present war tariff would be reduced by the Republican party so soon as they gained power. They now have the President and both houses of Congress, and we are told since the election that the surplus is to be reduced by additional pen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions, the Blair Bill, appropriations for a navy and coast defences, with the removal of the internal-revenue taxes on tobacco and alcohol used in the arts; and if any allusion is made to the tariff, it is hinted that a reduction of import duties will be on the basis of the Senate bill which passed that body during the last Congress. By this measure the duties were retained on salt and lumber, and increased on the fine cotton fabrics made in New England, and on woollen goods and hardware.

The Republicans cannot reduce the tariff. Their chief reliance for the funds necessary to carry the elections is upon the protected manufacturers, and the system is so dovetailed and interdependent that to attack it in any part loosens and destroys the whole fabric. It is a vast "combine," embracing in its giant grasp the whole country, and bound together by greed. Its advocates claim that the laboring man is the principal recipient of its blessings, and when during the last session of Congress it was proposed in the Senate to remove the duty upon bituminous coal, eloquent orations were delivered describing the happy homes of the coal-miners in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois, for whose benefit this duty was imposed. Not a Republican Senator failed to vote against the motion, and the tax was retained. It is to be hoped that the defenders of this tax have read, since the adjournment of Congress, the stories of famine which have come from the coal-mining districts, where desperate men and starving women, with hollow-eyed children, have waited in vain for the promised blessings of protection.

But there is another shadow at the Republican feast that will "not down." The Grand Army has thrown its iron glove into the arena, and boldly proclaims that, unless the present enormous pension list is increased from time to time, the men who saved the country "will know the reason why." There is something humiliating in the spectacle of an American President and his Cabinet cowering before this Pretorian Guard and industriously hunting ways and means to retain its favor. When the abuses of Tanner's administration of the Pension Office became so flagrant as to be no longer endurable, the ex-grand commander of the Grand Army was solicited to accept the office of Commissioner so as to placate the veterans, whose indignant murmuring over the removal of Tanner was borne to Washington; but the ex-grand commander, who at the last grand encampment had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counselled his comrades to demand a service pension for every man who had served in the Federal Army, and assured them it would be granted, knew too well the temper and power of the body over which he had presided, and declined the proffered honor. We read of something marvellously like this in the latter days of the Roman Empire, when victorious armies overawed the government and dictated laws.

It is our sincere hope that the American people will soon recognize the shameless abuse of their gratitude to the real soldiers of the Republic, which is now seen in the ever-increasing pension roll, gathering accumulated volume as we recede from the war, and which comes from measures invented by pension attorneys at Washington, and supported by Congressmen anxious to obtain the soldier vote and afraid to oppose the demands of those who are masquerading as defenders of the nation's life.

In the last Presidential election Harrison received two hundred and thirty-three electoral votes and Cleveland one hundred and sixty-eight, making the former's majority sixty-five in the Electoral College, although of the popular vote Cleveland received a majority over Harrison of 93,431. Of the electoral votes for Harrison, New York cast thirty-six and Indiana fifteen, making together fifty-one, which number taken from the vote of Harrison and added to that of Cleveland would have given the former one hundred and eighty-two and the latter two hundred and nineteen electoral votes, or a majority of thirty-seven for Cleveland.

Whilst there are now four hundred and one electoral votes, there will be in 1892, with the thirteen electoral votes of the new States, four hundred and fourteen votes in the Electoral College; and if every State votes in 1892 as in 1888, except New York and Indiana, and they support the Democratic ticket, it would be successful, although the entire thirteen votes of the new States should be given to the Republicans. If the States of New York and Indiana change to the Democrats in 1892, then the Democratic ticket would be elected, although the Republicans should carry all the new States, and also Connecticut or West Virginia. Or if the Republicans carry in 1892 all the States they carried in 1888 except New York and Indiana, they would be defeated, although they should gain the votes of all the new States except Montana, and the Democrats lose Virginia, or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West Virginia and Connecticut. In other words, if the Democrats carry New York and Indiana in 1892, together with Montana, they can lose both West Virginia and Connecticut, or Virginia, and elect their ticket, if the other States vote as in 1888 and the Republicans gain the votes of Washington and the two Dakotas.

At the last election for President, Harrison received in New York 650,338 and Cleveland 635,965 votes, while Fisk, the Prohibition candidate, had 30,231, and Streeter, the Union-Labor candidate, 626; so that Harrison had a majority of 14,373 over Cleveland, but less than a majority of all the votes in the State. In Indiana Harrison received 263,361 and Cleveland 261,013 votes, while Fisk had 9,881 and Streeter 2,694, giving Harrison a majority over Cleveland of 2,348, but only a plurality in the State. Out of 1,854,109 votes in the two States of New York and Indiana, Harrison had a majority over Cleveland of 16,721, showing that a change of *eight thousand three hundred and sixty-one* votes from the Republican to the Democratic candidate would have elected the latter President.

New York and Indiana are Democratic States, and only corrupt means can change their electoral votes. In these States must be fought the Presidential contest of 1892, and no Democrat should doubt, in view of the facts presented, that it will result in the triumphant success of our principles and the vindication of Grover Cleveland's honest and brave administration.

G. G. VEST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR NATIONAL CONCEITS.

BY MURAT HALSTEAD.

CONCERNING certain conceits of our countrymen, it should be stated, before subjecting them to critical consideration, that they are to the average American citizen a precious possession. A conceit is not necessarily fanciful or false, but is rather a pleasing presumption, possibly a generous illusion, the estimation of a quality or faculty a shade beyond its actual worth, an appreciation of one's own merits that quickens into an exaggerated self-esteem, a vanity in the valuation of the things one holds, the perception of a peculiarity in that which is one's own that carries it beyond the sharp line of testimony and bestows upon it an individual flavor.

There are conceits national and conceits personal. The American citizen has something of both, and the national conceit sometimes magnifies the history of our own country at the expense of that of the other nations of the earth, and has even gone to the extent of glorifying a wrong, and vindicating, so far as it may be accomplished with arrogant assumption, errors obvious to mankind.

It is within the recollection of millions when it was one of our conceits to associate the worst form of slavery in the world with the most gaudy ideas of universal liberty. The nation, for this presumptuous sin, passed through a process of purification and education, and one of the first advantages gained through the awful sacrifice of war was the ability to see ourselves as others were seeing us. When the folly and the wrong were known, betterments became possible.

It was an American conceit that we might actually ignore the lessons that through the ages had been accumulated in the experience of men, that we might violate the great historical laws that prescribed the necessity of justice, and go on by some inherent quality, surpassing anything that had been achieved, with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out paying the penalties of the ignorance of truth or the wantonness of error.

There was a time when American vanity prevented the great mass of the people from comprehending that we were upon the verge of civil war, and as certain to drift into it as one in the rapids above the falls of Niagara to go over the precipice; and the strangest folly was the opinion, obstinately held on either side of the line that divided the mustering armies, that those opposed would not fight. One of the guarantees of peace in the future is that we know better than that all around.

It is one of the teachings of the war that there is no peculiar exemption for the American people from the calamities that have befallen other peoples, and we have passed from the vain incredulity on the subject of war, the irritable assertion of its impossibility in the face of the currents that rendered it inevitable, to take a pride in the extraordinary extent and destructiveness of the warfare in which we were five years engaged, and the warlike capacities of the men of all the States abundantly shown.

American conceits, often aired at home, are always conspicuous abroad, and the leading purpose, if not the ruling passion, of the American in another country, especially if he has not made himself as conspicuous as he would like at home, is to inflict astonishment upon the strangers within whose gates he may be. A friend just starting for a tramp in the British islands declared that he would show the British in a few days that he "could stamp on their soil with a pair of American-made, square-toed boots." Another rejoiced, in the railroad stations of France, to rush across the tracks; and the pains the French railway officials took to prevent him from destroying himself amused him excessively. Still another occupied himself chiefly, in a tour of several weeks, shouting for ice-water and American breakfasts, and showering maledictions upon the servants who could not understand, much less accommodate, him; and he thought the louder he scolded and swore the better he was speaking the language of the land.

Once I heard an American in a smoking-room in an English hotel engaged in conversation with a British officer on the subject of the war in this country. The American was a young Kentuckian, who, desiring to impress his interlocutor with the amenities of our civilization and the refinements of home influences, had just told an anecdote of a neighbor and companion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who galloped into the county town while court was in session, his belt stuck full of revolvers and a double-barrelled shot-gun across the pommel of his saddle, and spurred his horse up and down the street, defying everything and ready to murder any and every body in a moment, and sure to get the drop on one who criticised his performance. The response of the officer to the touching narrative was that the story was "something extraordinary." He listened intently, and ventured, when the hero of the tale rode off in triumph, brandishing his shot-gun and daring the world in arms to fight, to change the subject by observing: "I suppose that the battles of the Franco-German war were far more bloody than any of those in the war in your country."

The expression of the young Kentuckian was that of indignant amazement. "No, sir," said he in thrilling tones; "the battles that were fought in my country were the bloodiest that were ever fought anywhere on earth. Now, take the battle of Shiloh; it raged without a moment's intermission for seven days and nights. When it began it was in the midst of a dense wilderness on the Tennessee, and when it was ended there was not a tree standing within nine miles of the river, and twenty thousand men were killed on each side and were dead in the fallen timber."

The British officer remarked: "It is astonishing. I think you possibly mean that there were twenty thousand men on each side killed, wounded, and missing; say forty thousand on both sides *hors du combat*. That would be sufficient, I should say, for a great battle," and he called for another brandy and soda.

"No, sir," said the citizen from old Kentucky; "there were twenty thousand dead on each side, and they were buried where they fell. There was nothing like that in the French and Dutch fighting"; and, of course, there was not. The incident may illustrate one of the phases of the conceits of the American citizen. It is not worth while for anything to happen in any other country comparable with that which occurs in the United States.

An amusing form of the pride of our countrymen is the endless self-assertion of the American traveller as to the superiority of our sleeping accommodations on the cars in the United States, and the wonderful advantages derived from the use of brass checks in relieving ourselves of the care of luggage during long journeys. The miracle of the identical trunks with the identical brass checks turning up at the right moment, without

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the requirement of personal supervision, is so incessantly mentioned and regarded as a virtue, and pointed out with pride, that it is almost in the nature of a mania.

Reflection should teach the traveller, at least the travelling patriot, that such superiority as we have in methods of spending nights on the cars, and relieving ourselves of the care of trunks, grows out of the fact that we make more long journeys than any other people. Whatever merit there is in this we should entirely appreciate, though the impressiveness of perpetual boastfulness on the subject may be questioned. It is quite as indisputable as the superiority in the length of our rivers, the extent of our fresh-water lakes, and the amount of our sea-coasts, if we neglect to compare them with the shores of British North America, and Russian Asia, and Australia, that we fly about the globe with longer-range facilities than any other portion of its population.

But the persistent belief of the American abroad in the incomparable advantages of his system of roaming up and down the earth at home is something so continually met, and so pathetic in some of its aspects, that it will hardly do in treating the subject to touch it with humor. The emotions are enlisted.

It does not seem to be absolutely established that the English, French, and Germans, and other Europeans also, are semi-barbarous because they habitually build the lines of their roads heavier than we do and run trains that are lighter. They have, too, pretty good accommodations for sleeping on their through trains, though they do not, as a rule, in their sleeping-cars, tuck away great quantities of bed-clothing without ventilation in boxes overhead, where in the summer time they get the benefit of the sun from the superheated roofs; and if we make specialties of certain conveniences on our trains, we should remember the perfection of accommodations at the stations abroad.

European cars are quite well ventilated when the people themselves permit the air to circulate in them, but the average native of Europe has a conceit of the terrors of a current of air that is a weakness of the imagination happily absent in the American. It is an alarming thing in a crowded and heated car in Europe, even if there are dogs present, or gentlemen redolent of malt liquor and tobacco, to open a window. A general shudder ensues, and a gesture, if not a word, of apology is in order.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The portentous betterment of a baggage-check when it is brass rather than paper is an American specialty that will hardly bear the analysis of hostile criticism. The miracle of the brass is that it travels around and about and gets back in the same place, and keeps forever in circulation, as if it were possibly a representative of the solar system or a legal-tender coin. In Europe a check serves just once. It is a slip of paper, but if you hold it fast it is good for your luggage, no matter how far you go. If you have half a dozen pieces, they are weighed, their weight is carefully put down, and each piece of the series numbered with the same figures. The figures are on your flimsy paper scrap, and if it is ever so small and slight and blotted, it calls for all you have at the end of your journey.

Arrived in Paris from any point of the compass, no matter how much property you have in boxes and packages, if they have been intrusted to the road service, they will all turn up together at the right place, if you know enough to find it, for they are numbered as of the same lot, and your bit of paper with the corresponding figures calls for it all. Or in London you know you are to sail on a steamer from Liverpool for New York, and the number of your room; be on time at the baggage-office, and have your bags and boxes and bundles duly marked with the name of the steamer and number of room, and "for the hold" if you do not wish to see the article before crossing the ocean; and you may move confidently through the chaos of frantic people and the giddy maze of sea-trunks in circulation. Many will not, but all might. The chances are very great that nothing will be lost or mislaid. Do not indulge the conceit of fretting, but be calm, and you will find your belongings in the state-room, and at home the long-lost trunks will rush down the slide from the steamer into the hands of our accomplished custom-house officers.

The American, though, is wronged, as a rule, in his own mind, when his baggage is weighed; and to be charged a pretty lively figure for each pound that is above one-half the weight of the average human being is a source of grief for which there is no consolation, as it is unreasonable. There is not any notion more obstinate in the American traveller than that he is entitled to take half a dozen Saratoga cottages without stoves with him, and to find them thundering after him whenever he gets into his hotel; but if he has to pay charges in Europe for a few weeks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon his ponderous *impedimenta,* he begins to grow weary and to take a more philosophical view of personal rights, for he doesn't need to carry a row of houses with or without cooking-stoves.

The most provoking of the American fancies about a foreigner to a foreigner—and everybody who has not been born in the United States is to the American citizen a foreigner, just as all the people in the days of the Roman Empire's glory, except the people of Rome themselves, were barbarians—is that he is called upon to sympathize, from the ineffable altitude of a favored being, with the down-trodden life of effete despotisms.

Mr. Lowell has remarked on the "Certain Condescension" of some eminent strangers with respect to Americans, and if the foreigner should reply, he would probably, if apt in phraseology, dwell upon that Certain Compassion with which the American citizen regards those who are so unhappy as to be identified with any country other than the Great Republic that is bounded by two oceans and a lot of ice that endures and sand that burns forever.

Shall we say it is the conceit, or the pride, or the fancy notion of the advertising American that his palatial sleeping-cars are among the most beautiful evidences of an advanced civilization, that his sixty-feet-long boxes on wheels, night or day, with a miscellaneous company of from thirty to seventy people, offer the most commodious and entertaining and luxurious method of travelling known, and that the omnibuses and carts and wagons and carriages employed in the United States are, each of its kind, so much better than any that can be constructed in Europe or Asia that it is matter of surprise that the inhabitants of all the countries and the islands of the sea do not appreciate the taste and brilliancy of all his vehicular miracles, and send immediately to get the latest patterns, and listen with delight and awe to the hum of machinery, the buzzing of genius, and the music of the eagle?

The American looks with scorn upon the harness of a cart-horse in London or Paris, and with good grounds in some respects certainly, for there never was any sufficient reason assigned why a horse that has a tremendous burden to draw should be loaded with a gigantic collar weighing half as much as the cart. We may hope for the ultimate emancipation from the tyranny of collars over the French horses, because the cab-drivers in Paris have discarded them and adopted the American-sized collar; but the British harness will probably remain in its original proportions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unimpaired by the evolutionary influences of the slow centuries. The abatement of the horse-collar in France is a great concession, and some of the conceit of the French people must, in some unaccountable way, have been taken out of them before they consented to it, if, indeed, they know what they have done.

That the American should travel through Europe bearing with him the highest estimation of the many advantages of his own country, is not only commendable in itself, but it is in every way warranted by the existing conditions. That part of the conceit of the traveller, however, which interferes with his enlightenment in those affairs in which the Europeans, through ages of experience upon the same soil, have the advantage of us, is a form which should be deprecated. It is not the true feeling of American patriotism that is conservative of the bliss of ignorance or the joys of indifference.

One thing that should take the conceit out of the American in foreign travel, so far as to bid him to recognize the eternal laws that the nations must obey, or perish, is the absence, throughout those countries of western Europe that are most familiar, of the wastefulness that exhausts the natural resources of this vast and bountiful and beautiful continent. It should be conducive to careful self-examination before indulging overbearing self-sufficiency, to remember that we do not, as a habit, go abroad in our own ships, and that the food we throw away, the fuel we scatter to the winds, the houses and goods that feed our excessive and unexampled fires, the manures we cast away, the grain we do not gather, and the fences that decay, make up an aggregate of loss that would be equal to the maintenance of the standing armies that we deplore as a burden insupportable.

It is one of the unpardonable vanities of the people of this country to hold that our land is so favored that, no matter what is done, we shall still forever have advantages warranting us in perpetual profligacy.

The American continent has not been exhausted by centuries of the impoverishing processes that are in progress, but the time approaches when it will be essential to the salvation of our country that the lessons of thrift that may be learned abroad, if we are not too blind in our pride to behold them, shall be applied at home. We must cherish the riches we have inherited or we shall be a nation of prodigal sons, without a father's house for our final refuge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is an American crochet that the forests may be destroyed—indeed, that slaughtering trees is the beginning of the building of greatness and the development of fertility; that the mountains may be denuded of their natural protection; that the trees, and the mosses, and the fallen brush and leaves, and the entangled ferns and shrubbery that spread over them like immense sponges for the retention of moisture—nature's reservoirs of life-giving water—shall be torn way; that the hills may be made barren for the sake of a few sticks of timber, the brooks allowed to dry up; that the grasses need not be cultivated, nor the willows planted to protect the streams;—and so we prepare for floods and droughts alternating. We rejoice in our strength, not remembering that for all these things we shall be brought to judgment. Young men and young countries must alike yield to the divine laws or brave the retribution that is sure.

In this year there have been immense areas of woodlands swept by flames, and the capacity of the new States, where the fires have raged, to support the people of the future, has been impaired. There would not have been as great losses, taking into view the generations that are to come, if cities instead of forests had perished; and yet there is not a grave sense of the public injury and general damage. Concerning these things, we need a quickened popular understanding, and that the conceit of immeasurable resources, beyond all contingencies of irretrievable disaster, should be taken out of us before it is everlastingly too late.

Already we have experienced in Virginia the destruction of the soil by the continuous cultivation of tobacco, so that the lands that a century and a half ago almost literally were fruitful of gold when scratched with the hoe, are now wretchedly poor, productive only of a shabby second growth of timber. The oyster-beds that were the treasures on the coasts, and made the secluded bays that indent our shores reservoirs of wealth beyond computation, have been so cruelly robbed that not far in the future the succulent, excellent, and cheap food, eagerly sought far and near, will have been so far consumed and destroyed that the most rigid economy and careful cultivation can never restore the original opulence that, carefully husbanded, would have been exhaustless as the fisheries of the deep seas.

Shall we not be taught to care for our national inheritance until there are consumed, in our remorseless extravagance, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

virgin riches of the soil, the exuberance of the forests, the food fishes of the streams, the herds that were nourished by the grasses now burned, the flocks of wild fowl that made the marshes musical and darkened the skies? When shall the conceit be taken out of the American people that they are so cared for by a bountiful Providence, whose lavish hand shall pour upon them perennially from horns of plenty, that they can afford to squander in heedless profusion the resources with which the continent was wonderfully endowed?

One of the troubles of the American traveller in Europe, forced upon his attention, is that of obtaining wholesome drinking-water, and he compares his own country with those abroad in that respect, greatly to the disadvantage of the foreigner, and wonders why there are typhoid fever and poisoning from the use of bad water, and he grows weary even of the command of his medical adviser to drink beer and wine; and is forgetful of the Schuylkill that is the affliction of Philadelphia, and the poor water-supplies of the growing cities of New Jersey, and the malarious ice from the Hudson that sickens New York.

What shall move him to cast his eye far along through the years, and try to think of himself as an American citizen some centuries hence, or of the conditions of life that will be upon his children's children? What does he suppose will be the effect upon the water-supply when the woods are wantonly destroyed, and the rivers are dry beds or muddy torrents, and when the leading improvement which a city finds itself called upon to provide itself with is that the drainage, which should restore the wasted soil, shall be flushed into the streams, and at the same time that the water-supply shall be taken from them? Of course, the time must come when there shall be fever and no food in the rivers. The shameful and corroding sin of their pollution cannot go on forever without the appropriate penalty in poverty and pestilence, to warn the human race that lives of thrift, and industry in all good works, and cleanliness, and habits of caring for the general welfare, under competent laws enforced by enlightened public opinion, are requisite to the health, the prosperity, and the happiness of the whole people.

A conceit that should be removed from the American mind, as it might be without the loss of healthy self-consideration, is that these United States constitute the only country where there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been during the latest generation marked advancement. The truth is that all countries have improved in the era of railways and telegraphs, of steam and steel, the discoveries of the gold of California and the silver of Nevada, the rapidity and comfort of intercourse between nations and continents, the diffusion of intelligence by the press, and the wonders of mechanical achievements that have cheapened and bettered the housing, clothing, feeding, and teaching, and broadened and heightened all the possibilities of the education and comfortableness of mankind.

One who would be above or beyond the conceits that confine or narrow comprehension of surroundings should not limit himself, in regarding the progressive developments of the age, to the American horizon, for there are other countries than ours, though none are fairer, that have grown as rapidly as our own. We are not exclusive in our grand progress. The increase of wealth, material improvement, and popular advantages in Scotland, within forty years, has been almost equal to that of any State of the United States. Even Ireland is emerging from the gloom of her long impoverishment. And it is only to welcome the common light in the universe belonging to all civilization, to recognize, as it shines in our faces, that while we, upon the whole, have the advantages of greater growth from resources more deeply laid and richer and wider than any other country, still we are only advancing at the head of the procession along with the rest of the world, which is made better by a happier appreciation of the beautiful abundance of the earth, if we care for it as rational creatures should, and for the rights of men, and that they may know their duty to defend, preserve, cultivate, and enjoy the fruits of the earth and the fulness thereof. Estimating our national attitude and the dues and hopes of our country by these standards, it becomes us to part with so much of our conceits as may belong to the theory that we alone have an inheritance of enduring riches and abounding righteousness.

We should be contented to be the greatest and happiest of the nations, and find out before it is too late, without other tumults and wars, that there is no people so mighty that they can be unjust with safety, no fault worse than wastefulness of the substance of the earth we inherit, and no crime so perilous as to wrong the poor.

MURAT HALSTEAD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CORROBORATION OF PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY JOHN BURROUGHS.

DR. LYMAN ABBOTT, in criticising Professor Huxley in a recent number of this REVIEW, loses sight of a very important distinction—a distinction which Professor Huxley keeps constantly before him in the articles referred to; namely, the distinction between objective and subjective truth, between a statement or a proposition which rests upon outward, independent, logical evidence, and is addressed to the reason and the understanding, and one which is purely personal and subjective, involving the taste, the emotions, the hopes, the aspirations, and which is true or false according to the temper and experience of the person to whom it is addressed. When our theological doctors talk of the evidences of Christianity, they lay great stress upon the historical evidences; the root of the matter is here; these are real, objective, positive, and are matters of logical and scientific inquiry. The subjective evidences—that is, those which are furnished by the mental or spiritual experience of the individual and beget a feeling of certainty and security in his mind,—these are of quite a different nature, and our logical faculties can have little to do with them.

Professor Huxley, in his *Nineteenth Century* articles referred to, applies the scientific method of inquiry to certain alleged occurrences in the New Testament—occurrences which must rest upon objective evidence, if upon any, and in which the appeal of credibility is made, not to our faculty of spiritual insight, but to our reason and understanding. Is the story of the Gadarene swine probable? is it reasonable? does it agree with the rest of our knowledge? "The Gadarene miracle either happened, or it did not. Whether the Gadarene 'question' is moral or religious, or not, has nothing to do with the fact that it is a purely historical question whether the demons said what they are declared to have said,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the devil-possessed pigs did or did not rush over the cliffs of the Lake of Gennesaret on a certain day of a certain year," etc. "If that is not a matter about which evidence ought to be required, and not only legal but strict scientific proof demanded by sane men who are asked to believe the story—what is it?" Professor Huxley thinks a man who believes such a story without logical evidence is guilty of an immoral act. And so generally with the miracles recorded in the New Testament, and with demonology and possessions. These things are alleged occurrences in the outward physical world, and they are not supported by adequate objective evidence.

Men reason upon the subject of the soul's immortality, but the answer which reason gives is mainly in the negative. There is nothing that could be called evidence that man continues to live after the dissolution of his body. Yet Dr. Abbott is convinced that he does so exist; he realizes in himself "a nature superior to disease, decay, mortality"; and who shall gainsay him? who shall say he is illogical? The evidence he has upon this point is personal and subjective, and cannot be imparted to another. It has no logical or scientific validity, because it begins and ends with himself. It is not a question of reason, but of religious conviction. But all the questions in dispute between Professor Huxley and Dr. Wace are questions of reason and of evidence. They pertain to the outward, visible, concrete world of history and of experience, and can be settled in no court but the court of reason.

Dr. Abbott says (and he assumes to speak for "the great mass of Christian believers") "that there are propositions which men ought to believe without logically-satisfying evidence." This is what the old Mother Church used to say, and used to back it up with the stake and the rack. "Ought to believe"; that is, it is a man's duty to believe certain propositions addressed to his rational faculties, without rationally-satisfying evidence. It is to be regretted that the good doctor did not cite some theological or religious proposition, or some article from the creeds, that it is a man's duty thus to believe. Would he say that a man ought to believe any of the points in dispute between Professor Huxley and Dr. Wace without "logically-satisfying evidence"?—the swine story, the authorship of the Gospels, that Jesus said what he is reported to have said, that demonology is true, etc., etc.?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Huxley, I imagine, would be the last man in the world to deny Dr. Abbott's proposition that there is such a thing as spiritual insight, or the religious sense, and that certainties, or at least assurances and satisfaction, reach the soul through these avenues. The religious nature or the poetic and artistic nature is not occupied with logical processes or the reasons of things, but with impressions, attractions, intuitions, emotional processes, the divine, the beautiful, the enjoyable. We do not ask of a poem, or a work of art, or any work of pure literature, Is it true? as we would ask of a proposition of science, or the statement of a witness upon the stand, or the declaration of a creed, Is it true? but, Is it good? is it powerful? is it satisfying? does it move and nourish us? A poem must have poetic truth, but how different is this from mathematical or scientific truth, and by what different faculties apprehended! Neither do we ask of purely religious utterances like the Sermon on the Mount or Paul's Epistles, Are they true? but, Do they stimulate and exalt our religious sense? do they quicken and purify the spirit? Paul's theology may be true or false: what is forever true and real is his fervid piety, his spiritual power, his eloquent humility, and his love for mankind. His logical faculties may have been weak; the things which he believed, which lay in his understanding and satisfied his reason, may have been utterly inadequate to stand rigid tests, but for all that the power and value of his writings are beyond question. The same may be said of some of the fathers of the church, weak in reason, but strong in the spirit. Professor Huxley is strong in reason; his logic is a chain hard to break; but highly spiritual and imaginative natures would, perhaps, find little satisfaction in his writings. He is occupied with objective truth, not with subjective impressions. His mind is strictly scientific, and the results of his method of inquiry are hard to controvert.

He does not deny the moral sense, or the æsthetic sense, or the religious sense, as Dr. Abbott would seem to imply; he is not discussing questions that lie in either of these realms, but questions that come within the scope of reason and are matters of evidence. The questions of right and wrong in human conduct, of lying, of stealing, of murder, etc., which Dr. Abbott introduces, belong to quite a different sphere from the question of the authorship of the Gospels or of the credibility of the miracles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is the appeal to conscience, the appeal to taste, the appeal to our sense of the fitness of things, and there is also the appeal to reason, to the judgment, to our power to weigh and sift evidence. It seems to me that Dr. Abbott confounds these things, and in his reply to Huxley sets up a man of straw. If the great scientist had said that all truth and certainty come through the logical faculties, he would have laid himself open to the doctor's criticism. What he did say or imply was that all scientific, all objective, truth comes through our logical faculties. These are his words: "It is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty."

In the outward objective world a fact is always a fact. It is always pertinent to inquire into the truth of any alleged occurrence. St. Augustine says that the flesh of the peacock never decays. Is this a fact? If it was a fact in his day, it must be a fact in ours. Do miracles happen? have they ever happened? Is there a personal devil? Are we surrounded by a multitude of good and bad spirits who are seeking to influence our lives? Any objective evidence of the truth and reality of these things must hold good at all times and in all places. Two and two always make four, and doubtless always will. But when we enter the region of morals, we are in a world where all is plastic, indefinite, relative. Right and wrong are so only under certain conditions. It may be right to lie and steal and murder under certain extraordinary circumstances. "The certainties of the moral and spiritual realm" to which Dr. Abbott refers, and upon which he says "all æsthetic, all domestic, all political and national life are based," are not outward demonstrable certainties, like those of science, but inward personal certainties, which involve our constitution and our temporary relations to the universe and to each other.

Dr. Abbott says he feels but a lanquid interest in the critical discussion as to the authorship of the four Gospels. This may well be. It may be because Dr. Abbott is not primarily interested in questions of evidence, or in logical and reasoning processes. He is a moralist and preacher, and seeks the springs of conduct, not the sources of logical conviction. I believe he accepts the doctrine of demoniacal possession; it seems to suit his emotional and imaginative type of mind. But a man of science, as such, could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no more accept such an explanation of any form of insanity than he could attribute crystallization to the work of fairies or the wind and the storm to furies. The authorship of the four Gospels may not be a vital question to the religious mind, but, as a question, it is a matter of evidence, and not at all of personal impression.

If Christianity really rested upon evidence, if its vitality was solely dependent upon verifiable facts and considerations, like a work of science, it would have perished from the earth long ago. But it does not live by its so-called evidences. Christianity is largely a matter of the heart, of the feelings and the emotions. It has not rested upon logical evidences; its main hold in the first instance has not been upon men's scientific faculties, but upon their hopes, fears, aspirations, and spiritual cravings. Paul says: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Neither can he. To talk about the reasonableness of Christianity is like talking about the reasonableness of magic or witchcraft. The human faculties are utterly powerless before its main tenets. Christianity has the vitality of literature, of poetry and art. The Gospel records have wonderful, even magical, power as literature. They are true, not as history, but as poetry.

The myth of the resurrection will be kept alive for ages to come, notwithstanding all that has been or can be urged against it, because mankind have such a profound interest in believing it.

Christianity does not offer a system of philosophy, but a religious incentive. When it attempts to play the rôle of interpreter of the visible order of the universe, or to satisfy our rational faculties, its failure is pathetic; its proofs are childish; its science is essentially pagan; its story of the fall as an explanation of the origin of evil, and its "plan of salvation" as a means of escape from that evil, as science, do not rise above any of the delusions of the pagan world. The story of the Chaldee god, Bel, who cut off his own head, moistened the clay with his blood, and then made man out of it, is just as rational an explanation of the origin of man as the one the Christian Church has always adhered to. In fact, the whole basis of our theology, the conception of Jesus as a supernatural person who had no earthly father, and who rose from the dead and ascended bodily up into heaven, etc., is essentially pagan, and belongs to an order of things that has long since passed away. The power of Christian-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity is a spiritual power; it is in its appeals to the ideal of the gentle, the merciful, the meek, the forgiving, the pure in heart —an ideal which has such an attraction for the European nations; and also to the love of reward and the fear of punishment which materialistic ages foster. In one is its charm for fine natures; in the other its power over the multitude.

Theological writers are in general prone to magnify subjective certitude at the expense of objective proof; to place faith above reason, in the domain of reason. They sneer at science and logic as if in their sphere they could be dispensed with and something else be substituted in their place. Thus Professor Blackie, in that vituperative book of his, "The Natural History of Atheism,"—a book the style of which is like a man going through a house and banging the doors behind him,—says, as a finishing stroke to the "drivel" of our "boastful science," that the "highest cognitions are never reached by the mere exercise of the knowing faculties, on whatever subject exercised." Not even, I suppose, when exercised upon the multiplication-table! "Instinct and aspiration," he goes on to say, "are higher than knowledge; and the pretensions of the merely scientific man to assume the dictatorship of things that be are not founded on nature. Many things can be known only by being felt; all vital forces are fundamentally unknowable; but they exist not the less because would-be philosopher B or would-be philosopher C has no machinery with which to measure or control them." Are instinct and aspiration "cognitions"? Do they belong to the sphere of knowledge? Do they even point to any certain and demonstrable conclusions? They may or they may not be higher than knowledge; it is certain that they cannot take the place of knowledge. Instinct and aspiration enlightened by knowledge is the desirable order, is it not? The only thing the scientific man assumes is that the scientific method is the only proper one with which to deal with the objective world of fact and experience. If the professor meant to say that some things are to be felt and not known, he is near the truth. The facts of science are to be known; we may know Kepler's laws; we can hardly feel them, since they are not personal. But truths of art, of poetry, of religion, are to be felt, whether we know them or not. They come to us by a synthetical, not by an analytical, process.

I have no disposition to overrate our mere knowing faculties; I only want to say that what we *know* we know through them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What we feel, or fancy, or hope forms no part of our true knowledge, and may come through other avenues. The perception of the beautiful is not a part of our knowledge; neither is the perception of the moral or the spiritual. These things are from within; they are subjective and not objective, and not within the range of the scientific faculties. They are real, just as pleasure and pain are real; they are experiences of the mind. The whole sphere of religion lies here; the kingdom of heaven is within you, not in some outward relation or condition.

Neither do I not wish to imply that there is any feud between science and true religion, between that part of man's nature which thirsts for exact knowledge—the red rays of the spectrum, so to speak—and that part of his nature which we call the spiritual, and which fades off into the vast unknown—the violet rays, at the other extreme ; nor between either of these and his æsthetic nature, his love of beautiful forms, though in different individuals these different parts will not be equally developed, nor will they be equally active in different races and times. The feud is between true science and false science ; between the conception of an order that is rational and one that is irrational, between modern pathology and Indian "medicine."

Exact science deals with and can only deal with the objective, the rigid, inexorable world of law. With the subjective, the world within us, the world of personality, whence comes all we call literature, art, religion, philosophy, etc., it cannot deal. Here exact demonstration is not possible; all is plastic, growing, conflicting, aspiring, indeterminate. The personal element modifies everything. The laws by which insensate bodies act and react upon each other may be determined, but the laws by which persons act and react upon each other are quite another matter. In the subjective world truth is relative, but in the world of science truth is absolute. Chemical elements always combine in the same proportions; moisture is always precipitated from the air under the same conditions; the operations of physical nature are uniform; given the same conditions, and the same results always follow. Doubtless the same results always follow the same conditions in the world of mind and personality also, but here the conditions are more obscure and more fluctuating, and science cannot grasp them.

Every original mind may have, and usually does have, a phi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

losophy of its own, a religion of its own, a political creed of its own, literary preferences of its own; but every mind cannot have a science of its own. The personal element is alien to science. How many systems of philosophies have there been from Aristotle down to Spencer? How many times have the old problems been explained? But one man's science must be another man's science; all science is a whole—a pushing farther and farther of the lines of knowledge into nature.

The hostility between the scientific and the spiritual, or the truly religious, may well cease, if, indeed, there ever has been, or ever can be, real hostility. We are bound to give the reason and the understanding full sway in their own proper fields. In subduing and in utilizing this world, or adjusting ourselves to it, we have no guide but science. Yet science is not the main part of life, notwithstanding all the noise it is making in the world. Science is making a great noise in the world because it is doing a great work. Literature, art, religion, speculation, have had their day; that is, the highest achievements of which they are capable are undoubtedly of the past. But science is young; it is now probably only in the heat of its forenoon work. It is a little curious that man's knowing faculties, the first to be appealed to, should be the latest in maturing; that he should worship so profoundly, admire so justly, act so wisely and heroically, while he yet knew so little accurately of the world in which he was placed. Does not this fact point to the conclusion that science is not the main part of life? It is probably the main part of our material civilization, of that by which we are clothed and fed and warmed and transported, defended in war and housed in peace; but of an intrinsic civilization it forms a less part. The old Greek had little or no material civilization in the modern sense; his civilization was personal and mental. What distinguishes the modern man is not his personal superiority, but the enormous engines and deft appliances with which he is fended and armed, and the greatness of his material triumphs.

Yet knowledge is not discredited, reason is not supplanted. We can no more dispense with them than we can dispense with the bones in our bodies. They furnish the framework by which our lives are upheld. All the certainty we have of the order of the objective world comes through our rational faculties.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Agnostic does not merely say that all knowledge is imperfect and fragmentary, nor that all certainty is based on the logical faculty; but simply that the understanding goes upon evidence; that in this world we have no guide to objective truth but our rational faculties. He finds no room for what our religious brethren call faith, because faith, as commonly understood, is a fatal undertow that swamps and drowns reason. He finds many things and enjoys many things which he cannot understand; he is not a stranger to the thrill of awe and reverence in the presence of the great mystery of the universe; but all propositions relative to the plans, ways, and nature of that mystery that are not verifiable, he fights shy of.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE TELEGRAPH RATES TOO HIGH?

BY NORVIN GREEN, PRESIDENT OF THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

A GENERAL discussion of telegraph rates, both in the newspapers and in business circles, seems to have been provoked by a recent official correspondence in respect to the rates to be paid on government messages. Nearly every newspaper throughout the country has had something to say on the subject. Many, without rhyme or reason, have denounced existing rates as exorbitant, while many others, better informed, evidently realize that it does cost something to construct and equip telegraph lines and to maintain and operate them.

Rates for telegraph service are necessarily predicated on the cost of the plant and on the current expenses of maintaining and operating the lines. No telegraph system would be maintained and operated as a private enterprise except at rates that would yield revenues sufficiently above the cost of maintenance and operation to pay a reasonable remuneration on the capital employed.

CAPITAL INVESTED.

And here we encounter the frequently reiterated outcry of dividends on watered stock—a clamor that could be more justly and more reasonably applied to any of the large railroad companies, whose lines extend to the great metropolis, than to the principal telegraph company of this country.

Within the last twenty-four years, and since that company has been domiciled at the city of New York, more than twenty-five million dollars of its cash earnings, and the proceeds of six million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars of bonds, making nearly thirty-one and a half millions in cash, have been expended in the construction and extension of its lines and in the purchase

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of additional telegraph properties; and during the same period twenty-eight million four hundred thousand dollars of its capital stock have been paid for the purchase of the various telegraph companies it has absorbed. Sixty-one and a half millions have been expended in the growth and extension of its system since 1866, in addition to the forty-one millions of capitalization at that date. Its leased properties, including its trans-Atlantic and Gulf cables, represent about twenty-five millions more. With the other and smaller systems of telegraph added, it is safe to say that one hundred and forty millions of dollars have been invested in telegraph properties in this country.

Some of the lines paid for in capital stock were purchased at prices somewhat above the cost of their construction; while against that, over thirty-one millions of cash expended in the construction of lines under railroad contracts, with the assistance of free transportation and labor, would have cost 50 per cent. more but for these advantages. The surplus of these investments, unrepresented by any form of capitalization, is now about ten and one-half millions,—more than sufficient to counterbalance the alleged inflations in the early years of the history of telegraph companies. The capitalization as it now stands is not above the cost value of the company's properties, while a distinguished advocate of a government telegraph has repeatedly asserted that he considered the contracts of the company of greater value than its properties.

Very few of the original telegraph companies earned any dividends for the stockholders. Most of them did not earn expenses of maintenance and operation for a number of years; and the original investment in most of them proved a partial, if not a total, loss. Although the average rates for the service were then four times as large as they are now, it was thus early demonstrated that, unless the companies could command business enough to employ the operators, they could not earn expenses. The cost to the companies of transmitting and delivering messages, especially for long distances, was then more than three times as great as it is at this date; partly for want of efficient machinery now in use, partly because there was not sufficient business to keep the operators constantly employed, and more largely for the reason that messages sent long distances had to pass over the lines of three or four, and sometimes of six or seven, different companies, by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each of which they were registered and retransmitted, causing not only a very expensive, but a very tardy, service as compared with that which is now rendered.

COST OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION.

The gross revenues of the principal telegraph company for the last fiscal year reported (see annual report, October 10, 1888) were $19,711,164.12. The total expenses were $14,640,592.18, being a fraction over 74 per cent. of the gross revenues. But a part of the revenues and a portion of the expenses did not pertain to the transmission and delivery of messages on the land lines, nor to the tolls derived therefrom. Eliminate from the revenues that which was derived from dividends on stocks in other companies, from the rent of private wires, from tolls over Atlantic and Cuba cables, and from premiums on money-order transfers, and the remainder, strictly the earnings for transmission of messages over the land lines, yielded an average of $31\frac{2}{10}$ cents a message on 51,463,955 messages transmitted, counting press reports at thirty words to the message. In like manner, deducting from the expenses the cost of maintaining and operating the Atlantic and Cuba cables, and the rentals paid for those cables, the estimated cost of maintaining private wires leased, including the "ticker" service, and the remaining expenses, strictly pertaining to the cost of maintenance and the operation of lines employed in the transmission of messages, show an average cost to the company of $23\frac{2}{10}$ cents per message on the number of messages transmitted, as before stated; the actual cost being a fraction over 75 per cent. of the tolls charged for the service.

There is no means of ascertaining the average cost of handling messages prior to the consolidation of all, or nearly all, the telegraph companies in 1866 and 1867. But for the year ending June 30, 1868, the average cost to the company of handling 6,404,595 messages was $63\frac{4}{10}$ cents per message, and the average tolls for transmission were $\$1.04\frac{7}{10}$ per message. With the rapid increase of business, both the cost to the company of handling messages and the tolls charged to the public have been steadily reduced year by year, until in the year 1887–'88 the average tolls per message were $31\frac{2}{10}$ cents, being less than one-half of what it cost the company to handle a message in 1868.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among the items that enter into the cost of handling 51,463,955 messages are salaries paid to operators, clerks, managers, and officials, $6,271,339.71—being a fraction over 13 cents per message; the cost of maintaining the lines, embraced in the items of superintendents, reconstruction, and repairs, $2,235,614.08—being about 4⅜ cents per message; messenger service, a little over $1,000,000—being about 2 cents per message. Thus we have in three general items—maintenance, operation, and delivery—a cost of 19⅜ cents per message handled. In addition to these are the rentals of offices, light and fuel, office repairs and furniture, instruments, battery material, taxes, legal expenses, and miscellaneous items, making up the remainder of the aggregate cost of 23$\frac{2}{10}$ cents per message.

It will be seen that more than half the entire cost of telegraph service, over thirteen cents per message, is in salaries paid managers, operators, and clerks; and this notwithstanding more than three-fourths of all the offices, embracing nearly all the small offices, are operated at no direct cost in money payment for salaries, under provisions of railroad contracts.

The cost of operating service is much below the average on trunk lines where but two operators are employed—one to send and the other to receive messages—and where the business is large enough to keep the operators constantly employed, as between New York and Boston, New York and Philadelphia, New York and Washington or Baltimore, and between New York and Buffalo. And yet a large number of messages are sent between the branch offices in different cities, doubling and tripling the work, as from a branch office in New York to a branch office in Boston, involving their transmission first from the branch office to the main office in New York, thence to the main office in Boston, thence to the branch office, employing six operators to handle the message, instead of two operators if it were sent between two offices only. Many of the branch offices, of which there are over one hundred and fifty in New York alone, do not have business enough to employ the operator one-fourth of his time, and at most of the medium-sized offices more operators have to be kept than the business will employ all day, because of the press of business in the three or four active business hours of the day.

There was a halt in the steady reduction of the cost of handling messages, and in the rates for their transmission, from 1878

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to 1884. This was because of the great effort to improve the service and meet the growing exactions of the commercial public. These increasing demands of commercial customers for prompt transmission have thrown the great bulk of the service into about four hours of the business day, requiring a constant increase of wire facilities and of the number of operators to give a satisfactory service; and demonstrate that a good telegraph service is necessarily much more expensive than a poor service.

An erroneous impression is prevalent that distance is not a very material factor in the cost of telegraph service. The ordinary telegraph circuit that can be relied on for constant working is about five hundred miles. Messages are sent one thousand, fifteen hundred, two thousand, and even twenty-five hundred miles with one direct writing, but over a compound circuit through repeaters about every five hundred miles, at each of which new battery force is supplied; and, though they are called automatic repeaters, it requires the service of a first-class operator at each repeater to keep it in adjustment; so that on a direct circuit of five hundred miles but two operators are employed, while a circuit of a thousand miles through repeaters employs three operators; one of fifteen hundred miles requires four; one of two thousand miles five; and one of twenty-five hundred miles (as is nearly constantly worked from Chicago to San Francisco) employs six operators. The principal items of cost being maintenance and operation, it may be plainly seen that to transmit a message fifteen hundred miles involves twice the cost of transmitting one five hundred miles for operators and three times the cost for maintenance. A message transmitted twenty-five hundred miles costs three times as much for operating service and five times as much for maintenance as one over a single circuit of five hundred miles or less. A large amount of business is done between the Atlantic seaboard cities and the Pacific coast, the distances ranging from thirty-five hundred miles to forty-five hundred miles. The cost of maintenance is estimated as proportionate to the mileage of wire; but in fact the cost of maintenance is materially greater per mile of wire on the lines crossing the mountain ranges and where there are few wires on the poles.

Having demonstrated the cost of telegraph service, and that it is more than 75 per cent. of the rates charged to the public, the profit out of which interest on bonded debt has to be paid does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not appear to be exorbitant; nor does it appear that a further reduction of rates could be reasonably demanded until the increase of business shall have brought about a reduction in the cost of the service. There are few other large corporations that could pay interest on their bonded debt and other fixed charges out of such meagre profits, and have anything left for their stockholders.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER COUNTRIES.

In every country of Europe the government owns and operates the telegraph. A few of the longer submarine cables are owned and controlled by private corporations; but private enterprise has long been prohibited from owning or operating any land system of telegraph. There is, therefore, no recognized responsibility to the customer for errors or delays, and little or no satisfaction afforded in answers to complaints. A sort of stereotyped form of acknowledgment is, substantially, that the matter will be inquired into, and if there be found cause of complaint the employees at fault will be disciplined. That is supposed to end the correspondence, and the complainant never gets any redress or any further information in regard to the erroneous transmission or miscarriage of his message.

Most of the governments find it necessary to control the telegraph for the very reason that its control by the government in this country has been opposed—namely, to protect the government from the people. In this country it has not been found desirable to strengthen the government against the untrammelled lawful will of the people. It is probable that very cheap rates for telegraph service are given to the public to reconcile the people to this enormous engine of power and espionage in the hands of the government. The rates within the comparatively narrow limits of any one of these countries for short distances, rarely exceeding five hundred miles, are generally somewhat lower than they are in the United States. But between any two or more of these government systems the rates are much higher than in this country, while the service is incomparably worse. Every one who has travelled in Europe will testify to that. With rare exceptions their telegraph service is provokingly unsatisfactory. Even between two such prominent commercial centres as London and Paris the service is so unreliable in point of time that some large commercial houses, when they want their messages to go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promptly, send from London to Paris by way of New York over the trans-Atlantic cables.

In an article published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in November, 1883, the views of an experienced news-gatherer, in regard to the comparative merits of the telegraph service in Europe and America, were given in detail and at some length, showing a state of facts which, according to the experience of those who succeeded him in the extensive use of European telegraphs, still exists. The following extract gives the summing-up of his conclusions tersely and pointedly:

"It has been forced upon my conviction by twelve years of intimate acquaintance with the business in America and six years of continuous experience in the same business in Europe that the average time of transmission on the Western Union lines is shorter than on any system in Europe or in any country of Europe; and that the number of errors made by American operators is much smaller than by European operators; and in these respects and all others connected with the principal part of the telegraph service the private companies have made steady and continuous improvement, while the tendency in Europe is to stagnate or retrograde."

This is simply what one would expect as the contrast between government management and private enterprise in a business requiring the most energetic and watchful diligence in all its departments, from the clerk who receives the message at the window to the messenger boy who delivers it at its destination. The management of these systems, like most government management, is cumbersome. A superabundance of officials, clerks, and employees, with the most punctilious observance of rank and gradation; not a few holding their positions by political or family influence, being notoriously incompetent, so that whatever falls to their lot is, of course, badly done. Such encumbrances appear to be a necessary part of the machinery of all departments of government, whether European or American.

Whether from these reasons or the low rates of tolls, or both combined, it is a well-known fact that all government telegraph systems are operated at a loss. In some instances the accounts are so blended with those of other departments of the government that the precise measure of loss cannot be readily demonstrated; but it is not claimed by any government that its telegraph system pays expenses. In Great Britain, however, the accounts are kept more distinct, and the annual statements, showing the gross receipts, expenditures, interest on debt, and deficit of the telegraph department, are incorporated in the annual report of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Postmaster-General. With these statements widely copied in the newspapers, the writer has been astonished to find in the columns of so well-informed a journal as the Boston *Globe*, on September 18, 1889, in an article headed "The Telegraphs of Two Countries," the following statement:

"The British government makes a profit on these low rates, too. The telegraph service not only pays all its own expenses, but yields annually to the treasury a surplus of over £4,000,000, or $20,000,000."

The last report of the British Postmaster-General that has reached this country is for the fiscal year 1887–'88. A tabular statement, showing the earnings, expenses, and interest on bonds of the telegraph department is given on page 9 of that report, which shows that the telegraph department never did earn any considerable part of the 3 per cent. interest on the bonds given for the purchase and extension of the telegraph, and that since the reduction of the rate in 1884 it has earned no part of that interest; and although the other departments of the government pay full rates for their telegraph service, the earnings have not been equal to current expenses. Leaving out the interest on bonds, the expenses for the last five years stated were more than £160,000 ($800,000) in excess of the revenues.

Another marked contrast between the American and European systems is the basis on which tolls are charged. On all the European systems the rate charged is per word with a minimum number of words, generally twenty, for which minimum the customer has to pay, though the actual number may be less. In England, however, in about 1885, the rate was reduced from a shilling for twenty words or less to sixpence for twelve words or less, and a half-penny for each additional word, all the words, including address and signature, being counted. In this country only the body-words of the message are counted, the minimum of body-words being ten or less, the date, address, and signature being free. The reason of that distinction is that in this country full addresses are courted to facilitate delivery.

The rate in Great Britain is lower than that of any of the systems in Europe, except that of Belgium, and a message of twenty words by the English count is generally one-fifth lower for like distances in this country than our ten-body-word message, which, including address and signature, generally contains twenty words or more. But not uniformly so. There are frequent instances

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of messages with long address, such as "C. P. Huntington, Vice-President and General Manager, 263 Park Avenue, New York City," and long signatures, such as "Samuel F. G. Johnson, Assistant General Passenger Agent," which, if charged for at the British rate of one cent a word for all the words, would make the message amount to at least thirty-two cents at the British rate, instead of twenty-five cents for the ten body-words, with address and signature free, as charged in this country. In this instance there are twenty-two words in the address and signature, and such instances are not infrequent.

But while the European rates are, in most instances, lower for short distances, they are immensely higher for long distances. The rate of forty cents carries the ordinary message from New York, Philadelphia, Washington, or Baltimore to Chicago or St. Louis—a distance of one thousand miles and over; while nowhere in Europe (except between Paris and Algiers over the French Government cable) can the same message be sent that distance for less than twice the amount charged in this country. Messages from Chicago or St. Louis to San Francisco and other points on the Pacific coast, distant from twenty-five hundred to three thousand miles, are transmitted for seventy-five cents, while nowhere in Europe can the same message be sent a like distance for less than four times the tolls charged in this country. Even for the shorter distances, where the message is between two or more systems, the European rates are very much higher than those of this country. For the maximum rate of one dollar, a message may be transmitted between the most distant points at which there are telegraph offices in the United States, the extreme distance being something over four thousand miles.

A message between any two points in different countries of Europe, involving a charge of the rates of both countries, however short the distance, makes a much higher rate of tolls than that charged in this country for a like distance. A twenty-word message by the European count is generally about equal in length to our minimum of ten body-words, with ten additional words for date, address, and signature. Such a message from London to Brussels, Paris, Amsterdam, Lyons, Strassburg, or Frankfort (the distances being from two hundred to four hundred miles) would be eighty cents, while from New York to Boston, Washington, Buffalo, Pittsburg, Portland, Me., Concord, N. H., or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burlington, Vt. (the same range of distances), the rate is twenty-five cents. From London to Venice, Barcelona, Copenhagen, Vienna, Rome, or Madrid (the distances being from six hundred to nine hundred miles) the rate for such message is one dollar and eighty cents, while from New York to Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis, Chicago, and St. Louis (the distances being from six hundred to one thousand miles) the rate for such message is forty cents. From London to St. Petersburg (twelve hundred miles) the rate is thirteen cents per word—two dollars and sixty cents; while from New York to St. Paul, Omaha, and leading points in Kansas and Nebraska (distances ranging from twelve hundred to fourteen hundred miles) the rate is fifty cents.

And why should not the rates in the old countries of Europe be lower than in this country? The systems are more compact, the population is more dense, and the lines are located mostly in an open country, requiring less expense for repairs and maintenance. The chief item of the cost of telegraph service is the pay of operators, which in those countries is less than one-half of that paid for operators in this country, while the business is concentrated in a smaller area and on shorter lines. Take, for instance, the British system as compared with that of this country—a system embracing 30,255 miles of line, 178,962 miles of wire, and 6,810 offices, and covering an area of about 129,000 square miles. That system transmitted, during the year 1887–'88, 53,403,429 messages; while over the principal system in this country, covering an area of 3,000,000 square miles, nearly twenty-five times as great, embracing 171,375 miles of line, 616,248 miles of wire, and 17,241 offices, mostly in a sparsely-settled and wooded country, there were transmitted 51,463,955 messages. To do a smaller amount of business by nearly two millions of messages there had to be maintained in this country more than five and one-half times as many miles of line, three and one-half times as many miles of wire, and nearly three times as many offices. With less than one-fifth of the mileage of lines, less than one-third the amount of wire, and with a little over one-third the number of offices, covering one-twenty-fifth part of the area, with cheaper wire, cheaper instruments, and cheaper battery and stationery supplies, and lower-priced labor, the repairs, maintenance, equipment, and supplies on the British system could scarcely cost one-fourth as much as on the larger system in this country. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

salaries of operators, messengers, and office employees being less than one-half the rates paid in this country for like service, it should not cost more than half as much to transmit and deliver messages in Great Britain as in the United States, especially taking account of another great item of saving—the larger amount of business concentrated in a smaller territory on fewer and shorter wires, giving constant employment to the operators. These items of maintenance, supplies, operation, and delivery of messages comprise more than four-fifths of the cost of the service.

The following comparative statement will show the relative cost of operators in London and New York :

Average Salaries paid to Telegraph Operators by the English Post-Office Department, at London (Central Station), in the year 1887-'88.

1,224 Males,	at monthly pay aggregating	$34,596.52
719 Females,	" " "	17.104.32
1,943 Total,	" " " "	$51,700.84

The average being

Males	$28.26 per month.
Females	23.76 " "
Males and females	26.60 " "

Average Salaries paid to Telegraph Operators by the Western Union Telegraph Company, at the Main Office, in New York, in the month of December, 1887.

471 Males,	at monthly pay aggregating	$33,705
193 Females,	" " "	7,095
664 Total,	" " " "	$40,800

The average being

Males	$71.56 per month.
Females	36.75 " "
Males and females	61.45 " "

It is difficult to appreciate the magnitude of the telegraph systems in the United States. Combined, they are more than one-third the entire telegraph systems in the world in mileage of lines and wires and number of offices maintained, and more than that of any ten other countries contiguous to each other. About six hundred and seventy-five thousand miles of telegraph wire are being operated in the United States,—sufficient to girdle the earth twenty-seven times. To expect this vast system, covering an area of three millions of square miles, in great part over rough and sparsely-settled territory, to be maintained and operated (at a cost for operators and linemen of more than double the rate of salaries paid in any country of Europe) at the same rates of tolls, without regard to territory, that are paid in the smaller countries of Europe, is unreasonable and unjust.

NORVIN GREEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF FICTION.

BY EDGAR SALTUS.

IT SEEMS but yesterday that the novelist succeeded the troubadour. It was the duty of the latter to amuse, to beguile an idle hour, to compliment and to please. But with the passing of the fantasist it has been discovered that the art of pleasing is the secret of mediocrity, that the scalpel is more useful than the lute. And as the old order changes, song and story change as well. Their mission is no longer to please; it is to cure.

To Madame de Châteauroux—and to any one else, perhaps, who happened that way—the fifteenth Louis of France was accustomed to assert that an attempt to overdress human nature was nothing less than high treason. This quip has since fossilized into an axiom. If in other countries, our own for instance, it has not taken root, may it not be that the soil is at fault? They have truffles in Périgord; there are none in Westchester. But there is a better explanation: we are succeeding in an attempt to complete a civilization which shall be distinctively our own. This effort, which, despite details that jar, is grandly manifest in the political, commercial, and social aspects of the hour, is yet in certain departments of literature, in fiction principally, still stumbling in unlighted paths. Now, fiction is in no sense the trivial thing which it is popularly considered. It is an educational factor of peculiar importance, one whose influence may be salutary or the reverse; moreover, it is the complement of a nation's annals, that insight into daily life which the ancient monarchies neglected to prepare for us, and through which neglect the volumes that treat of past grandeurs and decadence are handsomely bound and never read. In view, then, of the progressive tendencies of the hour, it is curious to probe the defection in this unique respect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this connection it will seem trite to say that no one begins to fresco a wall before the house is roofed; homespun must precede satin; utility, grace: as a nation we have been so fully occupied in attending to foundations that the need of festoons and astrogals has kept very few people awake. Those whom it has tormented have, generally speaking, been travellers from other shores. They have declared that we are lacking in traditions and ignorant of art. With the traditions we can dispense, at least for the present. Time, in which all things unroll, will fill that gap unprompted. But with art it is different. From whatever stand-point it may be considered, art, in its essence, is a theory; a corner of the universe, some one has said, interpreted by a temperament. With its trans-Atlantic achievements every one is more or less familiar. Impresarii bring with them applauded scores; the masterpieces of foreign painters we have usually a chance to examine. Yet in either case the theories that presided at their parturitions remain remote. The accusation, then, of the casual traveller is not without foundation. We are ignorant of art precisely as we are ignorant of truffles. We appreciate, we consume, but we do not produce. This defect, like that of the absence of traditions, Time, it is not utopian to suppose, will one day efface; we will have theories of our own and astonish the world with our conceptions. Yet that which in regard to music and the brush lends excuse to our present lack of enterprise is the fact, already noted, that Europe sends its masterpieces by express. Barring the question of national glory, we have no absolute need of composers and painters of native birth; we can enjoy Wagner without understanding a word of German, and a picture signed Millet may be admired without the interpreter's aid.

In regard to literature, however, and particularly in regard to fiction, it is permissible to strum a different guitar. We have the liberty no doubt, if we wish it, to digest English novels, but as a matter of fact we don't. Save in exceptions rare, yet happily existing, we leave them to the housemaid and the spider. The British author of to-day, as is the case with his German and his Italian brother, exists on the very thing we lack—traditions. He can, and does, with pardonable pride refer you to writers Who Came Before. When our country becomes as old as his, we can, and doubtless will, be able to do very much the same thing; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meanwhile we cannot delight ourselves with the other existing schools of fiction, the French and the Russian, for there is the Tower of Babel looming its inhibition at the very wish. The scores and paintings which Europeans produce may continue yet awhile to pleasure both ear and eye, but as for fiction translated, it is like a pressed flower—the charm, the aroma and life, have gone.

It may not, then, be impertinent to the purpose of this paper to assert that such fiction as we happen to have, while admirable in many respects, is native only in that the coloring has more or less of a local tint. Eliminate that tint, give it another, and the characteristics differ not at all from those to which the English novelist has accustomed us; they perfectly express a relative impression of What Should Be and What Should Not; they rarely express What Is. In the home manufacture the action may be a trifle more rapid; in the last chapter there may be fewer births and obituaries and a finer regard for the reader's privilege to take this and that for granted; but in the main the model is the same, and it is of this model that the public is getting weary. What it wants is something else. Less of the magic lantern, perhaps, and more of life; not that particular phase which ought to be and is not, but life in its pettiness and occasional splendor, and displayed, too, with so little ink that at the last page the reader may murmur, "I would recognize those people on sight." In view, however, of certain conditions of thought, an attempt of this kind is less easy than might be supposed.

To give a novel that interest which shall differentiate it from a disquisition, a plot is necessary. In that plot there may be a murder, a forgery, some misadventure, the loot of an illusion—all of these elements, if need be, and more of the same kind; but there must be love, and therein lies the difficulty. The murder may be committed in circumstances of such atrocity that the reader will scream with fright; the forms of villany exposed in the forgery or in the misadventure may rival anything in the Newgate Calendar; but love, in this country at least, must be treated from the Puritan stand-point. There would, of course, be no difficulty in so treating it were the Puritan stand-point the only one from which it could be viewed. Unfortunately for human nature, there happens to be many another one than that. In a novel, then, which aims to portray life not as we want it to be,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but as it is, why should the various phases of the lever of existence be omitted? Why, indeed? It cannot be because of the Young Person, for ignorance has never preserved a virtue yet. Nor is it because of any conviction that woman is always either vestal or monandrous, for we are aware that that is not the case. It may, then, be due to some conventional idea concerning the limits in which ornamental literature should move. In that event we may wonder whence it came. Certainly not from the British classics, nor yet from those which we regard as our own. Perhaps, then, it is a secretion of the mind, a category of the intellect which, like the concepts of time and of space, has no existence outside of our own imagination.

To choose one argument from an hundred, consider Shakspere's suavest romance, "Romeo and Juliet." It is true that plot and characters are a transferrence from a story which Luigi da Porto fabricated out of a Veronese legend, and it is equally true that, the other day, somebody announced that Shakspere never wrote a line in his life. But let it be admitted that the tragedy in question is the work of another man with the same name; the beauty of the lines exist, the interest in hero and heroine remain unchanged, the drama is as palpitating as before, and yet the central situation, the one which lends it its charm and allurement, is not seduction, for in that case *Juliet* would be a victim to the wiles of *Romeo*, and the moralist might have his little say. But it is not that; it is a portrayal of that emotion which stirs the pulse of every youth, however noble, and every maiden, however pure, and one, parenthetically, without which the world would cease to be. And now, by way of example, let it be supposed that the legend of *Romeo* and *Juliet* is adapted and localized; that, instead of being the children of inimical robber barons, they are the children of rival jobbers in stocks; divest them of the magnificence of myth; put them here in New York; make them talk prose instead of melody, but preserve the central situation, and from where you sit you can hear the appeals to Comstock. To this it may be objected that the ability which Shakspere, or his namesake, possessed is overlooked, and on that hypothetical objection the point of this paper may safely turn;—there is no criterion by which a story can be judged as moral or the reverse; there are but two classes of fiction—stories which are well written and stories which are not.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The latter classification no one is ever forced to consider, but in the former are to be found the elements of that future branch of literature which may not be fiction, perhaps, or, at least, not fiction as we now use that term, but rather a sentiable psychology for the use of the idle, one that is dictated by the heart, one that whispers to the reader and disturbs him, and leads him unconsciously into that temple which Marcus Aurelius erected to compassion, to human kindness and abnegation of self.

To surprise the reader in this fashion is well-nigh impossible with the methods now in vogue. The ambitious writer has on one side of him a corpse still warm, in whose features he recognizes Romanticism; on the other is that silk stocking filled with mud which is the emblem of the Naturalists. But somewhere near at hand are tombs marked Dostoïevsky, Flaubert, Eliot—names that tell all yet nothing save disinterestedness, charity, and forgiveness of sin. Should he hesitate, he is lost, for romanticism has guiles and philters, the revery in the moonlight, the kiss of women, the shock of swords, all the luridness of melodrama enveloped in sonorous periods, round and empty. And naturalism, too, has its promises, the indignation of the critic, and coffers that overflow. Between allurements like these many have halted and will halt and conjecture, but presently, to-morrow perhaps, some hero of letters will brush them both aside and pass, with lip austere, straight to the tombs and kneel there and commune. When he rises, it will be with that novel which you and I await.

Concerning the possible elements of that work suppositions are not wholly idle. In any event it is permissible to fancy that the author will be too wise not to be occasionally stupid. He will leave conventionality in the skirts of the surplice; Goethe demanded more light—he will need more air, not the atmosphere of a seraglio, but some broad plateau where the lungs are invigorated by that mother of realism, nature herself. He will study the crowd and its emanations, the unit as well, and then, from his knowledge of nature and his knowledge of man, he will be able to explain the multiplicity of the ego, the variable influence of surroundings, the change of views that ensue. Behind the visible act will be the analysis of the invisible cause, the coördination of contradictories, the inevitable deduced from chance. And this so clearly, yet so objectively, that the reader who picks up the book as he might enter a fancy ball, suddenly, through the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere force of accumulated trifles and unobserved effects, will find himself among men and women who no longer seem, but are, who appeal to him, for whom he suffers, and for whose miseries he would devise a cure.

It is this that the coming novelist will do. In the perspective he may leave the nothingness of creeds, but in the foreground will be the majesty of that Unknown which our intellect has been impotent to grasp. He will do this, more perhaps, for always in his ears will be the mutterings of the Sphinx propounding the eternal riddle. And by way of reward, a year or two after his death one publisher will confide to another that Soandso is beginning to sell.

EDGAR SALTUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW INSTRUMENT OF EXECUTION.

BY HAROLD P. BROWN, NEW YORK STATE EXPERT ON ELECTRICAL EXECUTION.

FOR several years the writer has carefully studied the details of the many accidental deaths from electric-lighting circuits, in order to determine their causes and, if possible, to discover means for their prevention. Three classes of current are in commercial use: the continuous, which flows steadily in one direction; the pulsating, whose impulses are intermittent, though constant in direction; and the alternating, which is a series of rapid reversals. Investigation showed that the first and second could by proper safeguards be made harmless to the general public, while the third was by its very nature hopelessly deadly.

Early in June, 1888, these conclusions were published by me in a prominent New York daily, with a description of the necessary protective apparatus. At once I was fiercely and bitterly attacked by the adherents of certain alternating-current interests, who loudly proclaimed their current to be "perfectly safe." Feeling sure that many more deaths would be occasioned by dealing carelessly with this deadly agency if it were regarded as harmless, it seemed an imperative duty to prove my statements to be true, and I asked Mr. Thomas A. Edison for the loan of some necessary apparatus which could not be elsewhere obtained.

His enemies have not yet forgiven him for his great kindness in permitting me to make the proposed experiments in his magnificent electrical laboratory, which is, beyond doubt, the finest in the world. These experiments proved that my suggested apparatus would save life and rob the continuous current of danger, so far as the public was concerned, and that the alternating current would produce instant and painless death at very low pressures. This work, which was for the purpose of protecting life,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave me expert knowledge of death-currents, and brought to me a request from the New York State authorities to select and purchase for them the apparatus for electrical executions.

I was reluctant to undertake this, knowing that it would subject me to violent abuse, but I felt that this use of the "safe and harmless" current would educate the public to handle it with caution and thus save many lives. I declined to assume the responsibility of designing for this purpose a machine whose use would be an experiment with human life, but preferred to select a type of dynamo which had killed many innocent men who made accidental contact with its deadly wires. My experiments showed that the greater the number of alternations per second, or the longer the time of contact with the subject, the less was the pressure required to destroy life. It is therefore evident that the death-dealing qualities of various currents are approximately proportional to the product of the amount of electrical horse-power exerted in the body of the subject, the length of the contact in seconds, and the number of alternations per second.

The first factor is found by multiplying the current strength in ampères by the pressure in volts and reducing the product to horse-power by dividing by 746. By what is known as Ohm's law, the current strength will be always equal to the electrical pressure divided by the resistance in ohms. Therefore the amount of electrical horse-power received by a subject depends directly upon the resistance encountered in passing through his body. There has been a great amount of nonsense brought forward recently on this subject by numerous electricians and physicians who testified that the resistance of the human body could not be accurately determined because of its mysterious and enormous variations!

The greater portion of the electrical resistance of a living animal is in the skin, due to thickness of the epidermis, the presence of insulating fats and oils, and the lack of sufficient moisture. This resistance may be reduced by increasing the area of contact or the amount of pressure between the skin and the electrodes conveying the current, or by increasing the amount of saline conducting fluid in the tissues of the epidermis. If any one of these factors is permitted to vary, wide variations in the result are produced; or, in other words, a measurement of the resistance of a human body includes the resistance of the body

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself plus the resistances of the points of contact, which may be enormous. A New York physician recently cited a case whose electrical resistance was said to be 500,000 ohms, which is quite a high degree of insulation; in such a case the measurement must have been made between the pointed tips of long Chinese finger-nails bearing lightly upon the electrodes. One thousand ohms would represent the resistance of the body itself, the remainder being the resistance of the contacts and finger-nails. To settle this matter, Mr. Edison had resistance-measurements made of between four hundred and five hundred men, and with his characteristic originality devised means for obtaining practically constant factors. Two jars were filled with a weak solution of caustic potash and connected to the measuring apparatus. Each man dipped his extended hands into the liquid until the ends of the middle fingers touched bottom. The hands were immersed for thirty seconds before readings were taken. This delay permitted the potash to act upon the oil in the skin, converting it into a soap soluble in water, thus practically eliminating the resistance of contacts and epidermis.

The average resistance was found to be 1,000 ohms and the highest but 1,970; the variation being evidently due to the amount of skin surface in contact with the liquid, since the number of ohms per square inch of surface was practically the same in all cases in which the area was measured. The report of Mr. Edison's chief electrician, Mr. A. E. Kennelly, upon these tests is most conclusive. In ordinary applications of electricity to the human body, when the skin is not, by Mr. Edison's method, specially prepared to receive it, the passage of the current itself rapidly reduces the resistance of the epidermis by bringing into it more of the saline fluids of the body. The greater the pressure of the current used the more rapid is the fall of resistance.

Bearing in mind that the amount of electrical energy received by a person who accidentally touches two charged conductors depends upon the area, pressure, moisture, and duration of contact, as well as upon the difference of electro-motive force between the points touched, it is easy to explain the miraculous tales of the men who, often in good faith, claim to have received the "full force of the dynamo" without serious results. The man with the mandarin nails might receive 3,000 volts on his claw-tips without wincing, but he ought not to boast that he had "taken the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entire charge." A parallel case would be that of a man who survived a rifle-shot because the ball spent its force on a pocket-book and merely bruised his chest.

The physical effects of an electrical current upon the human body are three-fold. By what is called electrolysis, the saline fluids which form the conducting medium are decomposed, the hydrogen and acids appearing at the negative pole and the oxygen and bases at the positive. This decomposition and the passage of the current itself produce heat. As the volume of the hydrogen thrown off is double that of the oxygen, a movement of the liquid toward the negative pole is set up. Aside from this, a decided motion of the liquid in the same direction is caused by the passage of the current itself. If a vessel containing a conducting fluid be divided into two sections by a vertical partition of parchment, and an electrical current passed from one side to the other, the liquid surface will be raised on one side of the membrane and lowered on the other. In case the alternating current is used, the surfaces will remain level, but the constant change of direction of the electrical current will produce corresponding alternations in the movement of the fluid, thus delivering to the membrane a series of blows whose force depends upon the amount of electrical energy expended. Thus a man receiving a pressure of 1,000 volts, and having an electrical resistance of 1,000 ohms between the two points of contact, would sustain the force of 1.33 horse-power. Portions of this power would be absorbed in the production of heat and chemical decomposition, while the main effect appears in violent vibrations of the fluids and tissues, delivering tremendous blows within the vital organs.

This is undoubtedly the secret of the life-destroying power possessed by the alternating current. That the nerves share this vibration is proved by a recent experiment of Professors Ayrton and Perry. If in a magnetic field the alternating current be passed through a stretched wire, the latter will give out a musical tone if it be tuned to respond to the same number of vibrations as the number of alternations of current per second. It is evident that the molecules of the wire were vibrating before the string was put into the proper condition to produce sound. This is corroborated by the fact that wires become crystallized from carrying overloads of the alternating current for long periods, and by microscopical examination of the nerves of animals killed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by this current under high electrical pressure, since the nerve-sheaths are distinctly granular in parts of the body which have received the brunt of the current.

The chemical decomposition and heating effect of the current which a human body would ordinarily receive from electrical systems in present use would be too small to produce in themselves fatal injury, unless long continued, and there is not a case on record of death from these causes alone. It is true that the characteristic indication of death by electricity is the peculiar fluid condition of the blood and its dark color, which seem due, in part at least, to its loss of oxygen, since passing oxygen through it restores its normal appearance. But it has never been determined whether this produces or follows death, or whether it is caused by chemical or by mechanical action. As the combination between the blood-corpuscles and their oxygen is a feeble one, it seems possible that the current might disturb the relationship and set the oxygen free to form other combinations. On the other hand, the mechanical shock might produce the same result. In one of my early experiments upon animals, death was caused by a continuous current, and the characteristic condition of the blood was observed in a post-mortem examination by an able physiologist. It seemed probable that this death resulted from what is known as the extra-current from the magnets of the dynamo, which, on opening the circuit through the subject, would give a sudden rise and fall of pressure, analogous to the effect produced by a single alternation of current. Therefore in a subsequent experiment apparatus was used which prevented the extra-current from reaching the animal, and the highest then available pressure of the continuous current (1,420 volts) produced no ill effects.

In the latter case the amount of chemical decomposition must have been greater than in the first experiment, since much higher pressure was used. This led to the conclusion that pulsations, interruptions, or alternations of the current produced death, though it failed to determine whether the blood of the uninjured animal had been altered by the current, as in the other case, but restored to its normal condition by subsequent respiration. Dr. George E. Fell, president of the American Society of Microscopists, states that in a living amœba the protoplasm contracts when a feeble current of electricity is passed through the fluid containing it, and that a slight increase of current is fatal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is probable that a similar effect is produced upon the blood-corpuscles, and this experiment under the microscope would be interesting.

The physiological effects of electrical currents upon the human body have been accurately observed and described, though many physicians, through lack of mechanical knowledge, have false ideas on one important point. Since some men show signs of pain from a feeble current of medical electricity, which can be received by others without discomfort, it is assumed that the latter persons cannot be killed by any amount of electrical force. They might as well say that, since a trained player can catch a base-ball when thrown at a rate which would knock down and cripple a novice, a ball fired from one of Krupp's monster cannon cannot be relied upon instantly to kill a man whom it strikes. In each case it is merely a ball in motion that is dealt with, but the difference in the amount of power exerted is enormous. A continuous current causes a tingling sensation, stimulates nervous action at the negative pole, depresses it at the positive, and, if long continued, produces under the electrodes chemical burns or blisters due to electrolytic decomposition. The closing and opening of the circuit produce muscular contractions, which are intensified by alternating the current or by placing an electro-magnet in the circuit. An infinitesimal current passed through the sciatic nerve of a galvanoscopic frog causes a contraction which will lift a quarter of an ounce one-half to three-quarters of an inch. As this amount of work is beyond the power of the current itself to accomplish, it must be assumed that the electricity merely excites the nerve and allows the residual vital force to exert itself. If this be true, it may be possible that a heavy shock of electricity may cause a man's own muscles to kill him by their powerful contraction.

If a series of shocks are received at the rate of fifteen or more per second, the muscles controlled by the nerves affected do not have sufficient time to relax, and therefore assume a rigidity proportional to the number of impulses per second and the electrical energy exerted. During this state of muscular tension the sensory nerves in the parts affected seem to be deadened to external impressions, and dentists have long used this fact to diminish the pain of tooth-drawing. An increase in the number of impulses or alternations per second, or in the electrical pressure, produces

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a greater degree of insensibility to pain until absolute unconsciousness is reached. In my experiments, 0.101 electrical horse-power with 26.6 alternations per second produced unconsciousness and death; at 68.3 alternations per second, 0.075 horse-power, and at 288 alternations, 0.0049 horse-power, produced the same result.

Personal experience and the record of accidental shocks from electric-light circuits prove that insensibility to pain is produced by the continuous current at pressures of 1,800 or more volts, while the alternating gives the same result at about 160 volts. It may, accordingly, be confidently assumed that any reported case of intense suffering from an electrical shock is due to imperfect contact and therefore to low pressure exerted on the body itself. This is verified by the fact that such cases are usually accompanied by severe burns, and a burn is the evidence and result of poor contact. Applying the foregoing facts to electrical execution, it is evident that the alternating current is especially well adapted for the purpose. To determine what electrical pressure shall be used, it is merely necessary to search the death-records; the Jablochkoff system has slain its victims at 100 volts, while dozens have been killed at 1,000 volts. A contact such as was made by Mr. D. A. Henry, who was killed September 2 by 1,000 volts of this current, must have measured at least 5,000 ohms. He was instantly and painlessly killed by an expenditure of less than 0.275 horse-power. One-tenth of this amount has killed strong, vigorous men, but in order that no chances should be taken, the criminal's resistance can be reduced to 500 ohms by immersing both hands and feet in the potash solution. At 1,000 volts' pressure he would receive 2.75 horse-power, or one hundred times as much as is necessary to cause instant death.

A higher pressure would be dangerous to the attendants, since the alternating current even at 1,000 volts has killed three or more innocent men through contact with insulated wires. The preparations necessary for electrical execution are very simple. The condemned criminal's cell is visited by the prison authorities and his hands and feet are saturated with the weak potash solution which so rapidly overcomes the skin's resistance; during this space of thirty seconds or less his electrical resistance may be measured, though Mr. Edison's researches in this line have rendered even this unnecessary. Shod in wet felt slippers, the convict walks to the chair and is instantly strapped into position;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his feet and hands are again immersed in the potash solution contained in a foot-tub connected to one pole and in hand-basins connected to the other. With this perfect contact there is no possibility of burning the flesh and thus reducing the effect of the current upon the body.

Dials of electrical instruments indicate that all the apparatus is in perfect order and record the pressure at every moment. The deputy-sheriff closes the switch. Respiration and heart-action instantly cease, and electricity, with a velocity equalling that of light, destroys life before nerve-sensation, at a speed of only one hundred and eighty feet per second, can reach the brain. There is a stiffening of the muscles, which gradually relax after five seconds have passed; but there is no struggle and no sound. The majesty of the law has been vindicated, but no physical pain has been caused.

Such is electrical execution. And yet strenuous attempts have been made to befog the public mind in order to prevent the use of the alternating current for the death-penalty, lest the public should learn its deadly nature and demand that the Legislature banish it from streets and buildings, thus ending the terrible, needless slaughter of unoffending men.

HAROLD P. BROWN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

VI.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE LAST volume of this most interesting series of papers begins with an account of the attack upon and defence of Charleston. Were I bound to select out of all four volumes the set of papers which appears of most importance at the present moment, not only from an American, but also from a European, point of view, I should certainly name those which describe the operations at Charleston.

All European powers, England especially, are deeply interested in this question of naval attack *versus* land defence. Since the time of the Civil War many changes have, no doubt, taken place; many inventions have been made which greatly affect the relations between ships and forts. The size of guns has enormously increased. Torpedo work in all its forms has been immensely developed, and the use of the electric light has materially helped all night operations. Ramming has been taken more and more into account in the construction of all men-of-war. Various forms of armored ships have come into existence and have been subjected to all such experiments as peace admits. It is never very safe, however, to assume that anything will take place in war precisely as the result of peace trials would lead one to believe. It would be no good reason, however, for refusing to adopt new plans or novel inventions in our next war, because they have not been tried and found to answer well in some former one. To act upon such a principle would be to handicap very heavily the nation that adopts it. It would be to hand over many great advantages to a more courageous, a more intelligent, and a more enterprising enemy. But it is only possible safely and usefully to apply the results of peace experiments to war preparations by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studying as closely as we can the experience with which past wars supply us. Now, since the great Civil War in America came to an end, there has been no contest in which, on anything like the same scale, many of the points which the efforts to take Charleston illustrated have been tested by actual fighting. It is interesting to summarize the facts as they appear in these papers. We have ample evidence both from the side of the defence and of the attack. Practically there is no important difference in the conclusions to which the serial papers lead us.

If there was in the whole of the South one fortified harbor which the government of the Union was anxious to seize, that harbor was Charleston. The whole resources of the Federal dockyards—it may be fairly added, of the outside world also—the inventive genius of the most inventive people upon earth, and especially of the most able constructors, were unstintingly employed in preparing an armada for the attack which it was intended should be irresistible. The ablest naval officers who could be found were placed in command. In only one respect can it be considered that the attack was deficient. It was not possible to spare for the coöperating army more than a relatively small military force. Practically, therefore, the success of the attack depended on the fleet, increased to the fullest strength, being able to reduce the land defences. During four years of war, despite all these efforts, Charleston held out, and it only fell at last because the advance of General Sherman's army and the common progress of the war necessitated the withdrawal of the garrison.

Nor is it possible to consider that these records represent at the present time only "ancient history." We in England have lately had much discussion on the relations between land defences and the employment of fleets. Almost all our arguments are taken from the time of Nelson, or from even earlier days. No one who looks into the matter can fail to see that at least these records of the Civil War represent facts much more closely analogous to the present relations between fleets and land batteries than any other operations of the kind in previous wars. Many of the details of the story add greatly to its interest and value. General Beauregard, the successful defender of the place, is able to show that in many respects the defence was under serious disadvantages. He speaks of the "inadequate force under him" (page 4), whilst it was the boast of the Secretary of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Federal Navy that the preparations of the North by sea were of a kind "such as the hand of man had never yet put afloat." (Page 5.) The result of the first attack was wholly unexpected. "The repulse had not been looked upon as a thing possible by the North," and the news of the failure "engendered a heavy gloom of disappointment and discouragement." The Admiral was, of course, sacrificed by the Navy Department. He, however, like many other unjustly-used commanders, might securely trust that time would bring its revenge. The evidence of all those whose judgment can weigh with posterity tends to blast the reputation of the men who, by suppressing reports and perverting facts, continued to make it appear that the fault lay with the navy and its commanders.

As Admiral Rodgers says, not only had Admiral Du Pont been selected because of his well-founded reputation, but the commander of every turret ship and of the "Ironsides" was a man of known and approved skill and courage. None of these doubted the necessity for Admiral Du Pont's retirement from the unsuccessful attack. All of them consider that he was unjustly dealt with; and that the simple cause of the failure lay in the fact "that, whatever degree of impenetrability" the ships might have, they possessed "no corresponding quality of destructiveness as against forts." It is the serious duty of all our officers of the sister service to consider these experiences. If history has any value as a guide to the fighting of the future, it goes to prove how dangerous it will be to all naval officers if by any action of theirs they create a false public opinion as to the relative powers of ships and guns. If, as it would seem some of them wish to do, they succeed in making the public think that one gun afloat is worth several ashore, it is they who will have to make good that claim by success, when they are asked to attack heavily-armed and well-planned coast batteries.

The estimate in America at the time of the attack upon Charleston was altogether different; and most certainly the engines of war which have been invented since those days do not tend to redress the balance which during the Civil War told against the Federal Navy. The practice from guns fired from a floating target can never be reliable, and most certainly not as reliable as the practice from guns ashore. None but a fanatic on the subject will deny this, and the experience we gained by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bombardment of Alexandria in 1882 proves this conclusively. Our firing on that occasion may, I think, be fairly described as erratic, although the conditions as to sea and weather were most favorable, and the enemy's return fire was extremely feeble—indeed, beneath contempt.

The one success which attended the naval attack upon Charleston is at least as significant as the general failure. The attack upon the Confederate batteries on Morris Island, which paved the way for the bombardment of Fort Sumter, was successful precisely when the fleet and army were able to combine in the attack, and because they did so combine. If this story be compared with that of Admiral Farragut's great success at New Orleans, when he passed the forts below that city, it will be seen that there was nothing in those events which tends to affect the force of the lesson taught by the attack on Charleston. As mentioned when discussing the capture of New Orleans in a former article, Admiral Farragut's success was mainly due to the moral effect produced by his gallant passage of the forts. Ship against fort, and gun for gun, he never reduced those forts, and seems to have inflicted very little damage upon them. Again, taking the whole story of the operations on the Mississippi together, it is clear that, while it was vitally important to the success of the Federal military operations throughout the vast theatre of war that the Federal, and not the Confederate, navy should dominate the waters of that great river, the result could not be secured by the navy alone. It was General Grant's reduction of Vicksburg and his capture of the other forts on the Mississippi which converted that river into the exclusively Federal highway that cleft the Confederacy in two. This coöperating action of the naval and military services, mutually supporting each other, and the fact that neither can be neglected without direct detriment to the other, seem to be among the most important lessons taught in the whole history of the American Civil War. Those lessons are of world-wide interest. I do not think they are affected by the story of Admiral Farragut's brilliant success at Mobile Bay, into the details of which I must not allow myself to enter, as it was, practically, almost purely an affair of ships against ships.

Before leaving the subject I may venture, however, to express the admiration which all unprejudiced readers of these papers must feel for the skill and judgment with which General Beaure-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gard conducted the defence of Charleston. It may be gathered from his article that he agrees in thinking that when forts are fairly pitted against fleets the general officer in command on shore ought to consider that he has a task before him which, with brave men under him, he ought successfully to accomplish. And, further, that, as a rule, the naval commander intrusted with the attack of a well-fortified harbor will evince a prudent wisdom if he arranges for the coöperation of such a land force as will clear away some of the opposition with which his ships, if alone, would have almost insuperable difficulties in dealing. Our own expedition to Kertch, during the Crimean War, supplies the very experience which is wanting to complete the lesson taught by the attack on Charleston. At Kertch it was possible for a land expedition, supported by the full power of the navy, to gain just those advantages which are illustrated by the successful second attack upon Morris Island. As the result of our combined attack on Kertch, the navy secured a passage through the Straits of Yenikale, which they could not have obtained for themselves, or without the coöperation of the land force that had advanced upon Kertch. On the other hand, the army could not have acted without the assistance of the navy, both in securing a point for landing and in the direct support obtained from the guns of the fleet during the disembarkation. The success of this combined operation opened out the Sea of Azof to our gunboats, which, to use Mr. Kinglake's graphic phrase, "carried the invasion into the very heart of the Czar's dominions, and produced a material and moral effect almost equal to all that was achieved by the terrible sufferings and fierce struggles before Sebastopol."

The one thing, as General Beauregard has well pointed out, which he could not have resisted would have been a well-appointed and powerful Federal army, that would have coöperated with the Federal navy in an attack upon his works on James Island. The lessons as to the power which lies in the combined action of army and navy, and as to the importance, at least for the purposes of local defence, of a certain number of coast batteries, cannot be ignored. It would be, however, a great injustice to one of the best soldiers, most skilled engineers, and ablest strategists who fought in the Civil War, were it not to be freely admitted that the defence owed much of its memorable success to the genius of General Beauregard, the Todleben of Charleston.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Through the scenes still to be enacted before the war was brought to an end, we enter now directly upon an examination of what must always be regarded as the "last act" of this great human drama. In this study, it is interesting and instructive to compare General Grant's own account of the preparation for "The Campaigns of 1864" with General Sherman's paper on "The Grand Strategy of the Last Year of the War." Again and again in the course of the great struggle between Grant and Lee one is struck by the relative disadvantage of the position occupied by the Confederate leader in one important respect. The "grand strategy" of which General Sherman speaks covered the whole field of war, and General Grant took upon himself the immediate supervision of the most important of all the operations upon which the several Federal armies were employed. General Sherman's Atlanta campaign and Butler's movements on the south of the James River were as much under his general direction as General Meade's Army of the Potomac. On the other hand, Lee does not seem to have had any actual control over the movements of the Confederate forces that did not belong strictly to his own army. One naturally somewhat hesitates to accept evidence which is given by other generals who coöperated with Lee, since we have had no corresponding evidence from himself. It has always struck me, however, that in some respects even Lee's very greatness made his position tend to at least one unfortunate result. Lee was so great, not only in character, in genius, and in reputation, but in the affections of the whole Confederacy, civil and military, that, if he was not to be the commander-in-chief of all the armies of the Confederacy and to direct and control their movements, no one else could effectually take that place. The importance of this fact comes out perhaps most clearly in the period after Cold Harbor, and in General Beauregard's evidence as to the proposals he made at Richmond, of which I shall have more to say presently.

The military student must not forget that Lee was not at the focus of information in regard to the general course of the war outside his own immediate field of operations; that he had no responsibility with regard to it, and could not take upon himself to act from moment to moment throughout the whole theatre of war, as General Grant did on his side. Whilst this was the case, no one in Richmond, on the other hand, liked to act in any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decisive matter without consulting Lee. This seems to have given rise to a certain headlessness which, I think, is to be observed in the conduct of the Confederate authorities, civil and military, during this year of the war. It does not appear that this headlessness can be reckoned as the fault of any one particular man in Richmond. This fact could be illustrated by incident after incident throughout this volume, and those who read these pages with care will see for themselves what is meant. The majority will probably agree to some extent with what is said here, both as to the fact and as to the cause of it. The enormous superiority in the mechanical means of intercommunication throughout the States under the Federal Government made that possible for Grant which was not possible for Lee. All must agree with General Sherman that Grant's great merit as a commander was the ability and clearness of vision with which he grasped the whole of the situation. He saw not only the position of vantage in which he stood, but the fact that it was well worth while, and that it would be an economy of life in the long run, for the Union to pour out life and treasure unstintingly; that by so doing he must in the end wear out the Confederacy. Surely the Union owes its life to having found the man who was ready and able so to direct its overwhelming resources.

Whilst fully recognizing General Grant's clearness of perception and his boundless pluck and determination, it seems to me that, when the actual campaign from the Wilderness to Cold Harbor is closely and critically examined, few impartial educated soldiers will deny that throughout it Lee simply and completely outgeneralled his great opponent. To judge, as I must do, from these papers, it would seem that many very able Northern soldiers concur in this opinion. Which shall we take as the fairest summary of the feelings of the Northern army on this point? Major-General McMahon states:

"The men could not help reading and discussing certain facts. Two years before, this same army had been placed much nearer Richmond with comparatively little loss. During Grant's advance from the Rapidan he had the advantage, of which he freely availed himself, of ordering troops to his assistance, not begging for them as McClellan did in vain. He depleted the defences of Washington at his pleasure, and of new troops more than the number of men with which he commenced the campaign joined him before its termination at Appomattox. The line of the peninsula and the advance to Cold Harbor and the Chickahominy had been McClellan's second plan. His first had been a movement from Urbana, with the possibility in view of crossing to the south side of the James and compelling the evacuation of Richmond and its defences. This plan had been overruled in Washington, and that of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peninsula, also suggested by McClellan, had been approved as a compromise. But the plan of an overland march to Richmond, while protected navigable waters within our control led to the very door, was fully tried between the 3d of May and the 15th of June and had failed." (Page 220.)

Then, again, let us turn to the briefer summary by Major-General Smith. It is more technical in its language, but it is, fully as much as the other, supported by a detailed examination of the conduct of the campaign. He writes, at page 230: "In speaking of a concentration much better than the one which was made by the Army of the Potomac, Jomini says: 'The logistics were contemptible.'"

Turn now to the other side, and see what was the feeling of the Southern army regarding each battle of the campaign. See how the evidence given us proves that at the Wilderness Lee had exactly anticipated the very point where Grant would cross the Rapidan. (General Law, page 118). See how, taking advantage of the very movement he had anticipated, Lee flung his army upon the flank of the crossing enemy in such a direction that a part of Meade's army, had the whole operation been worked out as he intended, must have been cut off from the remainder, and driven into the river or the Wilderness in a condition of complete disorganization, if not to utter destruction. But the operation was not worked out as he intended. No; the course of the battle repeated incidents with which we are now familiar. General Longstreet's wing, arriving in magnificent order, was just a sufficient number of hours too late to produce the decisive result which Lee had justly reckoned upon. If analogy has any value, it is tolerably safe to say that, had Jackson been in Longstreet's place then, Jackson's troops would have reached the field, not perhaps in the magnificent order which Longstreet had the art of imparting to his men, but exactly at the very hour when Lee expected them. Had Longstreet arrived in time, the Wilderness would have been, as an offensive stroke, as brilliantly successful as that of Cold Harbor was as a defensive one.

Probably the most severe risk which Grant ran throughout the campaign, and the most brilliant stroke which Lee had prepared, was at the passage of the North Anna River on May 24. Lee allowed both wings of Grant's army to cross the river unopposed. They were completely separated one from the other, for the centre had been successfully checked. Both wings were at Lee's mercy. But Lee was ill, too ill for action, and I think it may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said that this illness, which confined him to his tent and rendered him incapable of action for the time being, in all probability saved Grant's army from a blow that would have postponed, at least for that campaign, the advance on Richmond. If that operation had been postponed, it is difficult to see how Butler's army could have escaped destruction. That great results have arisen, and that the very course of history has been on several occasions seriously influenced, through the illness of generals commanding in the field, is well known. It would, however, be difficult to find a more striking illustration of the fact than is here presented to us.

I think it would not be unfair to sum up as follows the story of this campaign: On May 3–4, 1864, soon after midnight, the Army of the Potomac moved out from its position north of the Rapidan, and prepared for the passage of that river at the very point where Lee, watching it, had fully anticipated it would cross, and where he wished that it should cross. General Lee had deliberately chosen as his battle-ground the very place where Grant's army was now about to arrive. He knew this tangled wilderness well, and appreciated fully the advantages which such a field afforded for concealing his great inferiority of force, and for neutralizing the superior strength of his antagonist. General Grant's bold movements across the lower fords into the Wilderness, in the execution of his plan to swing past the Confederate Army and to place himself between it and Richmond, offered Lee the expected opportunity to strike a blow upon his flank, while his troops were stretched out on a very long line of march. Undoubtedly Lee expected that Longstreet's corps would be up at daylight on the following morning, May 6, but in point of fact it was still at least two hours' march away. That delay gave the Federals time to commence the attack, and partly to intrench themselves on the ground where they had been attacked upon crossing. As a result, the losses were not materially different on the two sides, or, at least, the action was relatively indecisive.

Nevertheless, Grant was foiled in his first attempt and began his movement towards Spotsylvania, to march round Lee's right. He was again anticipated in this movement, and nothing very decisive happened until June 11, after the failure of the two Federal attacks on June 10. Lee then somewhat anticipated the moment at which Grant's fresh turning attempt actually began,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the "Bloody Angle" on the 12th was the result. That was the only means, and it was but a partial success gained by the Federal general throughout the campaign. Despite the capture of 4,000 Confederates at this point, no impression could be made upon the interior lines. Grant again moved eastward, and for five days the two armies manœuvred, one against the other, with little fighting. On the 18th June a final attempt on Spotsylvania was terribly repulsed. On the 24th and 25th June occurred the incident of the North Anna, to which I have already alluded. For two days at least Grant's army was in as critical a position as such a force could well find itself in. Once more Grant slipped away, and once more he found his opponent facing him. This time the position on the Totopotomoy River was too strong to be assailed; so he moved off towards Cold Harbor.

It is alleged on page 228, by General W. F. Smith, on the authority of General Meade's own statement, that Meade, annoyed by the credit which Grant was acquiring for a campaign which had been entirely worked out in its details by him, deliberately made no arrangements for the attack which Grant had ordered. Whether this be actually true or not, there can be no doubt from all the evidence that, from some cause or other, in the concentration of the Federal Army before Cold Harbor, and in the attack on Lee's position, the Federal Army was simply mismanaged and sent to useless butchery. Grant himself appears to admit the mistake made there. Nevertheless, it would be most unfair to assume that he was responsible for the disastrous details of that action. He throws the blame upon no one, and his silence on the subject is highly honorable to him. His method consisted, and wisely consisted, in a general superintendence of the whole campaign against the South, whilst he left the details to the several commanders of armies. He especially abstained from removing General Meade from the command of the Army of the Potomac. As it stands, General Smith's statement is a most appalling indictment of General Meade. It amounts to this: that, because the newspapers did not do him the justice to which he considered himself entitled as regards the movements of the army he personally commanded, he allowed that army to have a dire disaster inflicted upon it. The one merit of the campaign was the firmness and sternness with which it was carried on—elements which were imported into it entirely by Grant, and not by Meade. If General

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meade, from sheer, jealous sulkiness, did really allow the army under his command to be exposed to the awful slaughter it experienced at Cold Harbor, through lack of proper care and proper orders as to details, the crime was one for which no punishment, no condemnation, could be too severe.

It is quite true that by the end of the campaign Grant's doggedness had produced a certain effect upon the Confederate soldiery. All acknowledge it. But what was that effect? Undoubtedly they had begun to realize that, if the North would allow its soldiers to be exposed to such frightful butchery, the North might at that price triumph. But not for one moment did it modify the confidence of the Southern soldiery in their own great leader; and not even at the fatal moment of the surrender at Appomattox did a Southern soldier doubt that everything that any general could do for his army had been done by Lee. I fancy that if at Cold Harbor the proposal of the Irishman after the battle of the Boyne, "to swop leaders and fight it over again," could have been put to the two armies, there would not have been one hand on the Southern side held up to accept the offer. Would there have been none on the Northern? I fancy few of the Northern generals who knew all the circumstances would like much to put the question of the greatness of the two leaders to any such test. Of course, the opinion of armies is not always a fair one as to the capacity of generals. It is, however, a very important element in the actual power and effectiveness of a general in command. In this instance the opinion of the hour has been confirmed by the careful and critical examination of many able soldiers.

Meantime, while the Wilderness campaign had been proceeding, a very heavy blow had been struck against the South in the appointment of General Sheridan to the command of the Federal cavalry. Its organization as what is known in Europe as mounted infantry enabled the incomparably superior resources of the North in men, horses, and equipment to be developed with decisive effect. When, on the 9th May, 1864, at 6 A.M., Sheridan, with 10,000 horsemen, started on his Richmond raid, there was no force with Lee's army fitted to cope with him. Three days afterward the death of Stuart marked the end, at least as far as the Eastern campaigns were concerned, of the ascendency of the Southern horsemen. For an army like Lee's,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already shortened in its supplies, this fact was of dire consequence.

It is interesting to compare the circumstances under which this raid was carried out with those which attended the cavalry raid under Stoneman. Both to some extent partook of that characteristic of all such movements, that "to take the enemy by surprise, and to penetrate his country, was easy enough; to withdraw from it was a more difficult matter." (Page 153, Vol. III.) In that respect General Sheridan had the important advantage which the position of Butler's army south of the James River gave him. He was thus provided with a secure point to make for, where he could obtain supplies and a safe starting-point for his return march. Stoneman, on the other hand, was launched simply against the enemy's communications without a force sufficient to draw the whole of Stuart's cavalry after him. He therefore left them behind him, to serve Jackson admirably at Chancellorsville at the very time that the Federals were deprived of Stoneman's services. On the other hand, from the first the purpose of Sheridan's move was even more to ease Meade's fears as to the safety of his wagon-trains during the passage of the Rapidan in presence of Stuart's cavalry than to harass the enemy by attacking his communications. The movement was so made as to encourage and employ Stuart's cavalry during the general advance of the army. "Circumstances," as usual, "alter cases," and the practical difference of these two cases is well worth the thoughtful study of soldiers. Stoneman's raid, whatever its destructive effects, was a dangerous withdrawal from the Northern army of its eyes and ears at the very moment when it most needed them. Sheridan's raid contributed essentially to the general objects of the march of the Northern army, by keeping the Southern cavalry fully engaged at a moment when they might have seriously hampered Grant's movements by attacking the enormous train which his lavishly-equipped army left stretching out behind it beyond the Rapidan.

Taking all other parts of the theatre of war into consideration, the balance of advantage this year, up to the date of Cold Harbor, was heavily in favor of the South. Sherman had certainly pressed Johnston toward Atlanta, but had gained no decisive advantage over him. Beauregard had heavily defeated Butler at Drewry's Bluff, and had, as General Grant happily expressed it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sealed him up between the James and the Appomattox rivers as completely as if he were in a "bottle tightly corked." The unfortunate expedition to the Red River had come to an end before the Cold Harbor campaign was over, and had not improved the general situation. In the Shenandoah Valley for the moment the Northern forces were certainly advancing successfully, but the number of troops there was altogether small, and General Early had been already ordered to begin the movement which was to take him up to the walls of Washington.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TENDENCIES OF MODERN COMEDY.

BY CHARLES WYNDHAM.

THE features which give distinctive mark to our contemporaneous school of comedy-writing and of comedy-acting involve many subtile and complex elements. It is not possible to discuss all these within the limits which have been prescribed for this paper. So it seems best to sketch some of the more broad and salient aspects which may be supposed to interest the student of the theatre, with stress on such as may be called cumulative—in other words, such as are special and well-defined tendencies.

There has never been a time when the drama has had a stronger hold on the public mind than to-day. The novel and the newspaper have wrested from it certain functions which it was compelled to accept in earlier ages. But in suffering this diminution it has gained rather than lost, and been brought closer home to the hearts and hearths of men. Among all the arts it necessarily stands to the fore as the glass of the tastes and needs of society, its passions and sympathies, its hopes and fears, its errors and virtues. Here human nature looks on its *döppelgänger*. Shakespeare's summary in that *Ilias in nuce* where he describes the end of stage-craft to be "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature: to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure," fits the play even better than the play-actor.

This is preëminently the case with comedy. Tragedy deals with man in his exceptional moods, concerning itself mainly with the great elemental passions, human nature in a storm, its thunders and lightnings and tempests. Its spirit and methods have changed but little with the progress of time, and the very limitation of the material with which it works denies it much flexibility or power of growth. The tragedy of a past age, so far as we care

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for tragedy at all, is far more acceptable to us on the stage than that based on contemporary life; for in the former case it rises more easily into the domain of the ideal. Thus we like it in much the same fashion as we like poetry, and prefer its setting in the library to that behind the footlights. Even Shakespearian tragedy, that consummate flower of human genius, attracts but little as compared with Booth, Salvini, or Irving, who uses it as his vehicle. Those angry and fiery colors, as when

> "Some great painter dips
> His brush in hues of earthquake and eclipse,"

however they may still burn for us in the world's masterpieces, are not the pigments which limn our pregnant interests and sympathies. Tragedy, as a vital fact of the stage, long since passed its efflorescence.

Comedy, on the other hand, using the word in the larger sense, is immortal, and ever fresh in its growth. It lives with the sap of humanity and fits society like its skin. It rehearses the story of every-day life and manners, and shapes into art the normal, not the extreme and violent, experiences of man. It changes in its form and texture from age to age, from people to people, with Protean ease and quickness. Its pictures of virtue and vice are such as man may easily meet among his fellows in the salon or in the slums, at the hustings or in the workshops, in the club or at the races, in the streets or in the counting-house, in the church or in the gin-palace. The things represented are imbedded in the special characteristics of the time, and they are caught by art as the sun catches a face on the sensitive plate. This is the significance of good comedy, that it gives us, with a vivid, fresh presentment, warm from crown to finger-tip, the life that we ourselves live, brain-born and heart-born. It may wear a laughing mask, but more often than not a tear trembles near the smile, and a sense of something deep and serious lies close to the flash of mirth.

Thus seriousness of purpose is rapidly becoming a controlling element in modern comedy. The men and women of to-day are profoundly stirred by the varied problems which are pressing society for solution. Demos has raised his head from the nether world, and is asking questions difficult to answer and impossible to evade. Even in the United States, where the workingman has had from the beginning a far better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foothold than elsewhere, his voice is heard with no uncertain sound. The conflict of capital and labor in its varied aspects, trades-unions and syndicates, strikes and lockouts, makes this tumult felt far and wide. The sexual relation, with the cognate problems of marriage and divorce, offers many strange and perplexing issues. The woman's-rights agitation persistently looks us in the face and cannot be exorcised with either suave words or sneers. The war of religion and science, questions of public education, political and social issues growing out of the drinking habit, and a hundred others (to continue the catalogue would be useless), are knitting themselves into the bone and gristle of the period. Society is getting self-conscious in such dead earnest that it is turning sociological. Frankenstein is confronted, not by the one monster of his own creation, but by many of them, and he is equally fascinated and alarmed by the spectacle of the Titanic brood. Comedy drama can no more help absorbing such questions than plants can help absorbing the quality of the rich dirt in which their roots are hidden. If it were possible that it should be otherwise, it would become as barren and frigid as the stale jokes of the circus clown.

The brilliant comedy of the old English school, surpassingly clever as it is, and flavored with the finest intellectual relish, is losing much of its hold on modern audiences from the frequent lack of a strong central idea. It is only as the background for the genius of a great actor that the public cares a fillip about it. Yet with all its champagne froth and sparkle, the old comedy, when carefully scanned, is rich in evidence enforcing our contention. The period of the Restoration, which began that splendid reign of dramatic wit, was cancered to the core with licentiousness, but wore over it point-lace and diamonds. There were no social problems to solve, or—what amounts to the same thing—nobody was conscious of them. There were but few gradations in life—only sharp transitions. With the sparkling rakes of either sex life was a pure pleasure-hunt, and with Hodge at the plough-tail it was sheer endurance. Brutality in velvet and ruffles swaggered, and brutality in rags sulked. Between the two extremes there were but few interesting types, or, if they existed, they hid in a safe obscurity. Phyllis might be virtuous, the country squire might be honest and manly, the yokel might be loyal, but comedy made them all simple and stupid. The vicious scintil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lated with brilliancy and wit, and the good were as dull as the rustic mud out of which they grew. The art of the stage mirrored the facts of life. Yet, in defiance of all our moral disgust and lack of sympathy, the exuberant gayety and the flash of give-and-take in the dialogue still enchant us in the reading.

As the age became more earnest, and thought of other things than pleasure, it forced other things into the drama. Virtue, however, in urging her claims, for a long time did it with the strut and rant of the new-comer trying to win recognition in good society. During the whole of the eighteenth century the gradual lift of social and moral life is closely reflected in the work of the stage. When we finally reach the period of Sheridan and Goldsmith, vice may be elegant and insinuating, but it no longer stalks over the stage with a front of brass and the challenge of superiority.

If in the eighteenth century the hue and tone of society, with those interests most to the front, were faithfully reflected in dramatic art alike in its spirit and methods, we may expect our modern comedy to be equally true to its purpose. The deep social issues which had their birth in the French Revolution, and have more recently reached such a tremendous growth under the stimulus of the industrial arts and sciences, are convulsing thought, and this generation is caught in the very thick of the fray. New classes, new responsibilities and duties, new ideals, new dangers, new needs, keep touch with us in season and out of season, at home and in the street, in the business office and in the political assembly. They are beginning to take hold of comedy with a masterful hand. They are sure before long to assert a stronger lordship.

Let us glance for a moment at two plays recently produced in England, "The Profligate," by Pinero, and "Wealth," by Jones. Both pieces have excited great interest, and are such notable examples of the fresh force moving in dramatic art that a more intimate study of their peculiarities will not be amiss. In "The Profligate" the happiness of two is wrecked by the shadow of an almost-forgotten crime, and the folly is exhaustively discussed of believing that the happiness of a pure, young, virtuous woman is safe in the hands of a reformed rake. In "Wealth" we see how the absorbing love of gain destroys gradually our best feelings, distorts our natures, breeds misery at our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domestic hearth, instead of happiness, and can even shatter the reason of its victim. In all these the motive is subjective, and at a comparatively recent date in the history of the stage would have been deemed quite unsuited to dramatic treatment. Not only are these problems made to live in the action and passions of the people of the play, but they are elaborately discussed between the characters, sometimes with lengthy argument that reaches monologue. Crowded audiences, made up of the best people in London, were attracted for more than three months by these dramatic debates, and the hold of the play on the public was unmistakable.

The success of Henrik Ibsen's comedies in Germany and England, as well as in the Scandinavian countries, is a still more striking illustration of the tendency of the play of serious purpose to dominate comedy-writing. The great Norwegian dramatist has been described by his friend Georg Brandes as a hot-hearted pessimist, at odds with existing conditions, yet with full faith in the possibilities of the future, believing that all social wrongs will finally be removed by an inner revolution of the spirit of the present or of some future age. His passion for the development of individualism as the panacea for the great world-sickness of evil is intense, and is in some sense the key with which he would unlock every problem. The two plays, "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts," which have been produced with great success in London, created a deep and genuine stir.

The former may be noted somewhat in detail to serve the present purpose, though it has been so widely discussed in magazine and newspaper that doing this may be a supererogation. *Nora Helmer*, the heroine of the comedy, is an inexperienced and frivolous woman, who has, notwithstanding, resources of undeveloped strength. She is introduced to us as a wife who has been trained to accept her husband as her law and conscience. She commits a forgery to save his life and spare her old father misery, believing this to be the burden of duty imposed on her, and expecting *Helmer's* loving recognition of it. That he fails of this in true measure, but only forgives her for sinning against the law and expects her to resume that ignorance and dependence which had made her his submissive pupil, revolts the child now suddenly burst into the woman. He had not been willing to take on his shoulders the burden of the crime committed for him. Had he risen to that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stature, she would have died for him. But now they must separate is the decree of the doll wife. Her instinct tells her in this crisis that only by keeping her own individuality sacred could she insure the personal salvation of herself and *Helmer*. Holding him at arm's length would give both room to grow, and then, perchance, they might come together, equals in true union, each complementing the other. However fantastic the conclusion, we recognize in Ibsen's subtile and delicate treatment the gist of the great woman-question and an earnest groping after light, the lack of which darkens many a household. That such a play as "The Doll's House" could so powerfully affect English audiences is significant in showing the set of the current, even after making all allowances for the excellence of dramatic treatment.

In a recent professional visit to Germany, I saw a play which had been adapted from the Spanish and which made a vivid impression on the throngs who visited the theatre. This comedy had ample stage-worth in construction, but the feature which made it vital and a matter of widespread talk was the purpose hinted in the first act and carried through with widening revelation to the last drop-curtain. The play of "Galeotto" illustrated the social truth that scandal, though without reason, tends by its very existence to create the substance of fact, of which it was in the outset only the lying semblance. No spectator of the social battle so often waged with poisoned missiles lacks knowledge of parallels in real life.

One need not stop with the typical plays of purpose. There are but few strong pieces within recent years which have really got a mastery over the public, without tap-roots in questions of social need. All that need be made emphatic is that the tendency to work the field of serious comedy flows with increasing strength. The French school of comedy-writing, generally conceded to be a model in method, has busied itself greatly for many years with the attempt to answer social problems. The mere mention of the names of such dramatists as Dumas, Sardou, and Daudet suffices to recall to our theatre-goers a dozen familiar examples. The modern literature of the stage in Germany would be no less prolific in illustration, were it needed, as might be expected in the case of a thinking, sincere, and strong-minded race.

It goes without saying that as long as human nature remains the same it will take delight in wholesome fun behind the foot-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lights. The charm of gayety and mirth from elegant comedy to rollicking burlesque is immortal. The medicine of laughter heals many a human ill, and the brief nepenthe which the stage so often gives to overburdened minds could never be spared from its varied sources of beneficence. Yet with all the smiles and gambols of the laughing god, he must yield precedence in the pantheon of art to the deity who presides over the sorrows as well as the joys of men.

The sister-art of the novel has given birth to many masterpieces, which have been begotten by the desire to enforce a moral. The drama, however, has been in large degree the slave of the canon, "Art for art's sake," in the minds of most writers and actors. In obedience to this law each character must be, as it were, stripped to the skin. Not a word must be uttered which does not in some material way help the action of the story and give effect to a situation. The dialogue is compressed into brief sentences, and kept strictly within those limits which are prescribed by an iron theory. The author works in a strait-jacket, if his heart burns with some truth which he wishes to utter. On the one hand is set the reality that swift movement, action like the rush of the bullet to its mark, exhilarates like strong wine. To this must be added the fact that the drama must necessarily deal with the concrete, not with the abstract; with personalities, not with speculation.

On the other hand stands the truth that opinion and sentiment give keener edge and relish to action, and that what people do on the stage acquires a higher distinction from the glimpses which we are permitted to get of the domain which lies behind the flashing eye, the laugh, the frown, or the sneer. The windows can only be opened wide by speech. What can be done in this revelation of the inner world of man, without crippling the energy of action, is shown by the great Elizabethans. The tendency, as has been intimated, is to give to the drama of to-day a larger share of the factor of speech.

What is the *modus vivendi* by which apparently alien features can be made to coalesce? It must be found no less in the art of the actor than in that of the dramatist. It is no heresy to say that the best acting does not belong to the drama of action. Some players act with their temperaments, some with their brains, some with both. There is more than one clever player

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a well-won reputation who puts no more thinking brains into his art than would fitly go to the Neanderthal skull. In some cases, indeed, the law of heredity almost bourgeons into genius by sheer force of temperamental power.

A really noble delivery is now the rarest gift in the actor's equipment, partly, perhaps, because he has had but little comparative use for it. It is this, however, which lays the heaviest tax on mentality in acting; and with the fresh departure in comedy the task of the player, while more difficult because more intellectual, will be raised to a finer ideal. The long speeches which the French stage gives to the actor have wrought a school of natural and beautiful declamation which enchants an audience even more than the movement of the story. To deliver a goodly succession of lines with fire, smoothness, and simplicity, and with their full pregnancy of meaning, belongs to the actor's best art, as was fully enforced in the injunction of the great master to whom we must all hark back for definitions.

Another tendency of modern comedy is toward realism. This need not banish the creative or poetic element from the playwright's workshop. To draw people as they are and evolve out of their ordinary lives and interests a story which shall lay a spell equal to that of romance—no writer surely could have a higher ambition or a more arduous one. To call a spade a spade, to banish sham and humbug from dramatic delineation, to paint the very lines and wrinkles into character as the actor paints his stage-face, to avoid exaggeration of treatment and incident, appear to be the growing bias. Howells, James, and others have set this fashion in novel-writing, and a similar drift in the stage runs parallel to its disposition to discuss the serious problems of the time. That hardness of outline which generally threatens the realist should find its corrective in a characteristic of our age. The social law is repression and reticence. Men mask or control their passions, and cultivate restraint as the crowning grace of good manners. The student of his kind finds keen interest in noting the pull of passion and enthusiasm chafing at the bit, and the play of impulse constrained by decorum. These half-lights make each one a pleasing mystery to his neighbor and contribute an endless variety of tone for the use of the painter of character and manners. Suggestiveness is recognized as one of the most potential forces in art, and it may be made to suffuse the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realistic figure summoned out of life by the skill of the playwright with the charm of imaginative work.

The tendency of the comedy to realism has its effect in shaping the methods of the comedian. There was a time, not so very many years since, when the plays most in vogue permitted the player the use of a dozen conventional moulds, in any one of which he could shut himself up, like a man in armor, and walk on the stage a lively, talking puppet. Nowadays each fresh character exacts study and adaptation founded on a penetrating study of people who are playing their parts in real life. Those shades of distinction which differentiate men and women who resemble each other most closely, must not be neglected on the stage, to do justice to realistic comedy. Players have learned a lesson, too, from the restraint and self-command shown in actual society. No comedian who aims at the highest effects under the coming *régime* can begin too soon to master that sort of intensity which is bought with suppression and a studied moderation of method. The actor who tries to express everything succeeds in expressing nothing and hits in the air. The imagination of the audience, give it half a chance, will fully complete what he leaves artfully unsaid or undone. This kind of stage-craft strikes home, and the tendencies of the stage appear to foster it in many ways. The evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the future of the comedy will develop a finer quality of art in the player and give a higher intellectualism to the profession.

CHARLES WYNDHAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE THE REPUBLICANS IN TO STAY?

BY THE HON. GEORGE F. HOAR, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

PROPHECY is not one of the exact sciences. The wisest of our philosophers, Hosea Biglow, never showed more practical wisdom than in the admonition,

"Don't never prophesy—onless ye know."

That man must pay little heed to experience who undertakes to predict, with any confidence, the result of any future election of a President in this country. It is not true, although it is often said, that the voters of the United States are quite evenly divided between the two great political parties. There has never been a time since the war when the large majority of the legal electors of the country has not been on the side of the party that conducted the war to its successful issue. But it is true that the power which has overthrown free government in so many Southern States can still, by lawless processes, control so many votes in the Electoral Colleges that the next election of President must be decided by States in which the two political parties are nearly equal in numbers. We have, unhappily, had too many lessons that have taught us how slight are the causes which may change votes enough in what are called the pivotal States to give a majority to one party or the other. In addition to the chapter of pure accidents, like a heavy storm, or a flood, many petty circumstances, sometimes the fault of the candidate, sometimes contrived by dishonest and designing men, have decided the voice of great States. An unwise sentence in a letter of Henry Clay lost him New York and brought in Polk and Texas. The infamous forgery of the Morey letter deprived General Garfield of all the votes of California but one. That one was saved to him by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular dislike of a Democratic candidate for elector. The "artful aid" of Burchard's not very "apt alliteration" cost Mr. Blaine votes enough to enable his opponents to take from him the electoral vote of New York, and gave the country four years of Cleveland. If the course of foreign trade should cause a large export of specie from this country, and we should thereby be unable to maintain silver in circulation at its present nominal value as compared with gold, it is not unlikely that the party then in power would suffer seriously from such a condition of things, and be compelled by public indignation to give place to opponents quite as responsible for the evil as itself.

But we know better how to protect ourselves against these things to-day, so far as the Northern States are concerned. If we are able to defend ourselves against accidents, we can see no good reason why we may not expect the Republican party to keep the control of the executive, legislative, and judicial power of the country for another twenty-five years, and why we may not feel sure that it will retain its organization, its strength, its courage, and its ascendancy everywhere in the country where the American spirit dwells, where elections are free and the people well educated.

In the first place, the charge, so often made against the Republican party, especially by renegades, that it has lost its ancient virtue, that it has grown corrupt, that symptoms of disease, and decay, and dissolution are manifesting themselves, will not bear examination.

At the close of an argument on the question of jurisdiction, during the trial of General Belknap, in 1876, I summed up some of the evils which had grown up under Republican rule in the disturbed period which followed the war. Five United States judges driven from office by threats of deserved impeachment; four members of the House of Representatives detected in making sale of their right of nomination to West Point; the scandals of the Austrian Exposition and the Credit Mobilier; four judges of the State foremost in the Union for power and wealth impeached for corruption; Tweed and his accomplices in power in her chief city. I have never regretted, retracted, or modified a single utterance therein contained. I might have added other instances which it is hard, even now, to recall without a feeling of shame and indignation,—the dismissal of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Motley, the deposition of Sumner, the rejection of Dana, the putting the civil offices in great States at the disposition of the ambitions or the revenges of powerful and unscrupulous men, the sixty thousand fraudulent naturalization papers issued in New York. I did not then think that either the Republic or the Republican party was going to destruction. I made another speech a few months after, in which I compared the sixteen years which followed the war with the first sixteen years after the government was inaugurated,—the period of the administrations of Washington and John Adams and the first four years of Jefferson,—and showed that there had been in these administrations more corruption, not merely in proportion to the size of the country, but absolutely, than under the sixteen years of Republican rule. I never for a moment questioned the absolute honesty and patriotism of the great warrior and statesman under whose administration so many of these abuses had happened. The whole country, even his bitterest political opponent, concedes these qualities to him now. It never occurred to me that the Republican party could not and would not cure these evils when once its attention should be called to them. It never occurred to me that the remedy was to go over to the enemy; that the wrong-doings of the party that loved liberty were to be remedied by putting the country in the power of those who hated it; that we were to substitute for men who committed offences against the Treasury men who committed crimes against the elective franchise; that men who used patronage to gain political power were to be advantageously exchanged for men who used fraud and murder for the same end. Washington and the pure patriots who were his companions set themselves resolutely to resist and to suppress the evils of their time. But they did not send to England for Benedict Arnold. They did not restore the Tories to power. They did not go down on their knees to George III. and ask him to take them back into favor.

Among the marvellous achievements of the Republican party, none is more marvellous than the steady lifting itself and purifying the public service which went on until the change of executive power. The world had never seen an instance of a purer or more efficient body of public servants than that which President Cleveland found in office when he came in, in March, 1885.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Subject, then, to the dangers above suggested, which must exist wherever elections are free, which exist in England and France to a far greater degree than in the United States, it is believed that the Republican party is likely to enjoy a permanent tenure of power.

This view is sustained

(1) By a consideration of the quality and temper of the Republican party as compared with the quality and temper of its great antagonist.

(2) By a consideration of its composition—of the communities, States, and classes of men from which its strength comes, as compared with those from which comes the strength of its competitor.

(3) By a consideration of its history, as contrasted with that of the Democratic party.

(4) By a statement of the doctrines, purposes, and measures of the Republican party, which give promise of health, strength, vitality, permanence, touching the very life and health of the Republic; while those of the Democratic party are in their very nature temporary, short-lived, perishable, trivial, cutaneous.

(5) The new States and the new immigration give promise of large reënforcement of strength to the Republicans.

First—The Republican and Democratic parties differ radically from each other in quality and temper. There are men of all sorts—good men, bad men, brave men, timid men, conservatives, radicals—in both. But the men who have given character to the great free States of the North are, in the main, the men who have given and now give character to the Republican party. The men who gave character to the slave States of the South and to the civil administration of New York city are, in the main, the men who have given and who now give character to the Democratic party. It was always bold enough where the interests of slavery required audacity. It is bold enough now where boldness is needed to grasp political power for the Southern oligarchy which controls it. But in regard to all the measures on which depend the prosperity and progress of a free and growing people it is timid, reactionary, obstructive. President Harrison well characterized it as the "against" party. As he said in his powerful speech at Des Moines, Iowa, in 1883,

"It was against freedom in Kansas; it was against the war; it was against the draft; it was against emancipation; it was against a greenback currency; it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against reconstruction; it was against the amendments; it was against the Kuklux laws; it was against the Civil-Rights Bill; it was against the act to strengthen the public credit; it was against the resumption of specie payments. But it is not against any of these things now—it is underneath them."

It may be added that it was against the protective tariff; it was against the internal-revenue system; it is against the abolition of that system; it is against the Homestead Law; it is against measures for coast defence; it is against rebuilding the navy; it is against all practical measures for reviving our merchant marine; it was against the admission of the new States that are now coming in. The temper of the Republican party, on the other hand, leads it to be always on the look-out for new legislation, new improvements, and to use the vast legislative forces of the country, in all constitutional and practicable ways, in aid of its material and moral progress and welfare. It is the party that stands for something. It is on the growing side of the great political issues of the time. It has positive policies, not merely negative policies.

Second—When we consider the composition of the two parties, the States, communities, and classes of men from which the strength of each comes, we can form some rational judgment which has the larger and stronger vitality; which is the more congenial to the spirit of the nineteenth century, and which is likely to be the more congenial to the better and loftier spirit of the twentieth.

The Democratic party is made up, in substance, of the great bulk of the old owners of slave-labor and slave plantations, and of their children; of that portion of the population of our great cities and towns that were brought up where there were no free schools; of the keepers of liquor-saloons and those under their influence and control. Its strength is greatest where free elections are unknown and where the great historic frauds on the ballot have been committed in the past. The Republican party is made up, in substance, of New England; of the agricultural portions of New York and Pennsylvania; the States of the great free Northwest, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, whose territory was Freedom's birthday gift to the nation in the great year of the Constitution; Kansas and Nebraska, fruits of our first great conflict with the slave-power; Oregon, Washington and California—the larger New England which is coming into life on the Pacific; the Dakotas; Maine and Iowa, which stand at the head of all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human societies in the matter of education. These are the communities whose title to the confidence of the future is to be measured against those of Mississippi, and Louisiana, and South Carolina, and New York city.

The Bureau of Education a few years ago published a map of illiteracy, in which the territory of the United States was depicted in colors, the depth of the black shade indicating the degree of ignorance in different quarters as disclosed by the census of 1880. Afterward a newspaper published a colored map indicating the quarters of the country where the Democratic voters were most numerous and Democratic policies were ascendant. With slight and unimportant changes, the map of illiteracy would have answered for the map of Democracy.

There are some admirable men in the Democratic party. There are noble men among the Southern leaders. I have more than once borne willing and enthusiastic testimony to the many great and noble traits of the Southern people. When the fear of the negro is not before their eyes, and they are not possessed by the greed for political power, they are capable of excellent service to the State, both in war and peace. A prominent Alabama Democrat is said to have declared lately that, were it not for the negro, Alabama would be as surely Republican as Massachusetts.

But, giving our Democratic brethren all due credit for individual excellence, the fact remains that the men who do the work of piety and charity in our churches; the men who administer our school systems; the men who own and till their own farms; the men who perform skilled labor in the shops; the soldiers, the men who went to the war and stayed all through; the men who paid the debt, and kept the currency sound, and saved the nation's honor; the men who saved the country in war, and have made it worth living in in peace, commonly, and as a rule, by the natural law of their being, find their place in the Republican party; while the old slave-owner and slave-driver, the saloon-keeper, the ballot-box-stuffer, the Kuklux, the criminal class of the great cities, the men who cannot read or write, commonly, and as a rule, by the natural law of their being, find their congenial place in the Democratic party.

Third—The consideration of the history of the two parties encourages a like hope. The history of one party is a history of success. The history of the other is a history of failure. Human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature, especially American nature, must be largely changed before the people will listen to Democracy and Mugwumpery imploring them not to judge of parties by their records. Sir William Vernon Harcourt put this thing well in his great speech at Oxford in 1873.

"I am old enough to recollect the great influence and authority which the Duke of Wellington exercised over the English people. They did not say, 'Don't talk to us about *Waterloo* and the *Peninsula*. That is an old story. We know all about that. What battle are you going to fight next?' They thought and felt very differently. They said, 'Here is a man who has rendered us great services, and in whom we therefore trust that he will, if need be, render us great services again'; and those sentiments of national gratitude and national confidence were founded upon the instincts of generosity and patriotism. Well, what is true of great leaders of armies, is true also of great leaders of political parties, and of great political parties themselves. Their past is not forgotten. It is the solid basis of the confidence they enjoy."

The future will have its great occasions, its great perils, its great trials, its great opportunities, its great interests. They will be as much greater than those of the past as the sixty millions of 1890 will be greater than the thirty millions of 1860. The people will then inquire, not as to the foibles and faults of individual leaders, but for the men and the party that created the protective tariff, which made the United States the greatest manufacturing nation on earth; that turned our twelve thousand millions of wealth into thirty thousand millions and made the United States the richest nation on earth; that made freemen and citizens of four million slaves and made the United States the freest nation on earth; that enlisted, organized, and sent back to civil life a vast army, and created a great navy, constructed on principles not invented when it came into power, thereby exhibiting the United States as the strongest nation on earth; that contrived the national banking system; that created a currency which circulates throughout the world on an equality with gold; that incurred a vast debt and made provision for its payment,—with these measures making the credit of the country the best in the world; that devised and inaugurated the beneficent homestead system; that built the Pacific railroads; that compelled France to depart from Mexico; that exacted apology and reparation from Great Britain; that overthrew the doctrine of perpetual allegiance, and required the great powers of Europe hereafter to let our adopted citizens alone; that made honorable provision for invalid soldiers and sailors. They will put their confidence there. In every great crisis pregnant with the people's fate, they will turn aside from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men who opposed and obstructed all these things, The men who have forsaken us will return. The Mugwump and the Independent will come skurrying back. The Free-trader will forget his theory, and the scholar his dream. The capitalist will know where to look for security to his property, the laborer for good wages for his labor, the patriot for safety and honor for his country. I think, even now, the true patriot, though a Democrat, will rather trust the extension of our foreign trade to Mr. Blaine of the South American Commission than to Mr. Bayard of the Fishery Treaty.

Fourth—The doctrines, purposes, and measures of the Republican party touch the very life and health of the Republic. They give promise of health, strength, vitality, permanence. Those of the Democratic party are in their very nature temporary, short-lived, perishable, trivial, cutaneous.

A party extending over near fifty States and Territories must tolerate much variety of opinion in non-essentials. Its members will sometimes differ with each other as to the measures best adapted to accomplish purposes that are essential. But the Republican party has its creed and its statement of faith, from which no man can depart and maintain his Republicanism. Its Bible, its Creed, its Thirty-nine Articles, its Five Points, its Ten Commandments, are summed up in six essential propositions :

I—The equality of every individual citizen with every other, not only in legal rights, but in every opportunity and privilege of the State.

II—The obligation of the State to see that every citizen has an education which shall fit him for these duties and privileges.

III—The absolute freedom and purity of elections. The box where the American citizen casts his vote should be sacred as a sacramental vessel.

IV—The standard of wages must be kept up to the highest possible point. To that end, the policy of protection to American labor must be maintained.

V—Polygamy, which destroys the sanctity of the home, must be extirpated.

VI—The drinking-saloon, which corrupts and debauches the soul, and destroys the health of body and mind, must be suppressed.

This dignity and equality of manhood in a Republican State,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to which all the others above stated are essential, is the point to which all human society is tending. All the great forces of the universe are on its side. All the constitutional amendments, all the great measures tending to this end which have been adopted, or are proposed, are of Republican origin, and have been brought to pass or proposed against Democratic opposition. Does any thoughtful student of history doubt that they are strengthening day by day, and that the party whose wagons are fastened to those stars must be strengthening also? Will the people ever abandon either till it is accomplished?

The challenge has often been given and never answered that the Democrats should name any good national measure that they have either passed or tried to pass having either of these ends in view. I now think of no important law on our statute-book that is of Democratic origin, except the sub-treasury system and the Bland Silver Bill. Wherever wealth, education, power go, there Republican principles strengthen. As fast as the New South gets her factories and workshops the principle of protection is spreading.

Fifth—The new States and the new immigration give promise of large reënforcement to the Republicans. That party is likely to be the party of the future to which the people of the pioneer States join themselves by such majorities. As we write, Washington, North Dakota, and South Dakota are reported as having given large Republican majorities; while Montana, which a few years ago seemed as hopelessly Democratic as Kentucky, is reported as having chosen a Republican Congressman, with its Legislature in doubt. The new immigration, also, is bringing valuable addition to Republican strength. The steadfast, industrious, intelligent Scandinavian, lover of home, lover of country, lover of schools, lover of wife and children, finds his congenial place in the Republican party.

For these reasons, if the Republican party be but true to its ideals, I believe the future of the Republican party is as assured as the future of America. It will live, and grow, and rule until the South, like the North, is covered with workshops where workmen get fair and ample wages; until the returns of the elections everywhere represent the honest expression of the people's will; until, in America, the soul of man is reverenced everywhere without regard to the accident of his birth or the color of his skin; until the drinking-saloon is dethroned from its place of power in our politics; until Mormonism is extirpated.

GEO. F. HOAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DANGERS OF ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

BY THOMAS A. EDISON.

So MUCH has of late been said and written upon the subject of high-tension electric currents and their probable or possible danger to human life, and so many different opinions have been advanced by men whose positions serve to surround their utterances with an atmosphere of knowledge of the matter under discussion, that the mind of an unscientific public has been unable to come to any definite conclusion upon the basis of "expert" testimony. It is most unfortunate that a practical demonstration in support of the real facts of the case could not have been made in a less tragic manner than was witnessed a few days ago in New York by several thousand people; and yet if the martyrdom of this poor victim results in the application of stringent measures for the protection of life in the future, if the lesson taught is appreciated to the full extent of its fatal meaning, the sacrifice will not have been made in vain. With the increase of electric lighting (which to-day is used only to a very limited extent as compared with its inevitable future use) and the multiplication of wires, these dangers which exist now in a thousand different parts of the city will be manifolded many times. In fact, the opportunities for repetitions of the accident referred to above will be practically unlimited.

I can write upon this subject only as one convinced. I cannot discuss it otherwise. The public would scarcely be interested in the details leading up to the position taken by myself and the conclusions to which I have come, for the reason that it would involve a mass of matter such as they have been attempting to digest during several months past; and, instead of explaining, I might succeed only in adding to the present confusion of popular ideas. But I may say that I have not failed to seek practical demonstration in support of such facts as have been developed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and I have taken life—not human life—in the belief and full consciousness that the end justified the means.

The currents used for electric lighting at the present time may generally be divided into four classes :

First—The low-tension continuous current, with a pressure not exceeding 200 volts, used for incandescent lighting.

Second—The high-tension continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

Third—The high-tension semi-continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

Fourth—The alternating current, with a pressure from 1,000 to 3,000 volts and over.

The first is harmless, and can be passed through the human body without producing uncomfortable sensations. The second is dangerous to life. Momentary contact with a conductor of the third results in paralysis or death, as has frequently occurred ; and the passage of the fourth, or alternating, current through any living body means instantaneous death.

These are simple facts which cannot be disproved. There is a record of nearly one hundred deaths, which furnishes an unanswerable argument in support of these statements. Discussion and controversy may serve the questionable purpose of delaying popular faith in them, but they cannot change them ; and the sooner they are accepted and acted upon the less liability will there be of a recurrence of the late horror, which is still fresh in the minds of all those who witnessed or read of it.

It has often been asked why the number of accidents of this nature is larger in the city of New York than in any other city. The reason is that New York has a greater number of wires to the square mile than any other city in the United States. The percentage of deaths in other places will reach that of New York when wires are strung in like numbers ; but if electric lighting under its present conditions extends in the latter city proportionately, its death-rate will have been greatly multiplied by the time other cities reach its present high percentage.

Many suggestions have been made as to the best way in which to remedy the existing evil, and the popular cry seems to be, "Put the wires underground." But, instead of diminishing, this will increase the danger to life and property. There is no known insulation which will confine these high-tension currents for more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than a limited period, and when they are placed beneath the ground, with the present system of conduits, the result will be a series of earth-contacts, the fusion of wires, and the formation of powerful electric arcs, which will extend to other metallic conductors in the same conduit, and a whole mass of wires made to receive this dangerous current and convey it into houses, offices, stores, etc. It is thus evident that the dangers of such circuits are not confined to the wires which convey the high-tension currents, but other wires conducting harmless currents are liable to be rendered as deadly in effect as the former. It is evident, also, that a single wire carrying a current at high pressure would be a constant menace to the safety of all other wires in the same conduit. Even though these dangerous wires be placed in separate tubes in the same conduit with other tubes, the risk is not diminished.

Several instances are on record, and one I have particularly in mind, showing the possibility of serious accident through the crossing of wires. Near the corner of William and Wall Streets, New York, the underground conductors of the Edison Illuminating Company became crossed, and the current which was passing through them at a pressure of only one hundred and ten volts melted not only the wires, but several feet of iron tubing in which they were incased, and reduced the paving-stones within a radius of three or four feet to a molten mass. This system is so arranged that consumers are not affected by such accidents as this. They may and do mean expense to the company, but the public are entirely free from any possibility of danger. The crossing of wires in this way means the concentration of several hundred horse-power of energy in a small space. What would have been the effect of such a cross as I have described had the pressure been two thousand instead of one hundred and ten volts? and what also might be the effect were it to occur in a conduit in close proximity to hundreds of telephone wires and those of other electric-lighting systems? The risk, too, is greatly increased by the fact that consumers who are supplied with currents from a low-tension system are accustomed to handle their electrical appliances freely, knowing them to be harmless. If these are to be rendered at any moment dangerous to life, the result will be appalling. I say nothing of the injustice to vendors of harmless supplies of electricity.

So far, the deaths which have occurred from this source have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been chiefly confined to employees of electric-lighting and telegraph companies—men whose duties have required them to work in close proximity to the conductors of these death-dealing currents. It is true that a number of accidents, many of them attended with fatal results, have occurred to pedestrians on the streets of New York and other cities through the medium of fallen wires; but the risk incurred by the general public with the present system is really less than it would be if these dangerous conductors were placed in closer proximity to the ground. As the earth is approached the danger is multiplied. The connection and crossing of two wires by a line of moisture or liquid contact are just as effective as the contact of one wire with another when overhead.

That this error of judgment is not confined to the public, but is shared in by the officials of the city of New York, is made apparent by a resolution of the Mayor offered at a meeting of the Board of Electrical Control on Monday, October 14, and which is reported in the following form:

"That the numerous deaths caused by the electric light and power wires within the last thirty days, and the shocking manner in which they have occurred, furnish ample and sufficient proof that such wires are not being placed underground with a speed sufficient to insure the safety of the lives of the people of this city," etc., etc.

The logical inference here is that the lives of the people will be safe as soon as the wires have been placed underground. If a nitro-glycerine factory were being operated in the city of New York and the people desired to remove the danger, no one would suggest putting it underground. When it became necessary for the protection of employees and of the public to regulate boiler-pressures in the city, the authorities proceeded on lines entirely different from those which are being followed in connection with electrical pressures; and yet the cases are parallel, and the course of reasoning which resulted in a perfect system for the limitation of steam-pressure and the periodical inspection of boilers should be retraced, and the principle applied to secure safety from a pressure which, uncontrolled as at present, is far more dangerous than the former was before steps were taken to render it harmless.

The insulation of a wire carrying a high-tension current in the most perfect manner known may insure temporary safety; but time is bound to develop defects as the result of the action of the current upon the insulating material, of a change in the molecular structure of the material itself, and for other reasons. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pulsations or vibrations in an electric conductor cause corresponding vibrations in the insulation. So powerful is this effect that the insulation gives off a sound corresponding to the oscillation of the current. So long as the insulation retains its original elasticity, the current is confined ; but the influence of the air, or of gas and other agents, tends to change the elasticity, and the billions of vibrations to which it has been subjected finally render it very susceptible of being pierced by a spark of static electricity. Thus an avenue for the ingress of moisture is formed, not only in one spot, but in many, through which the current may be communicated to any conductor of electricity near enough to make physical contact, or a circuit may be completed between the two by a line of moisture or the formation of an electric arc, with its subsequent destructive action.

The numerous accidents which have occurred in the city of New York during the past year show to a very large extent the operation of time upon the insulating material which surrounds these wires. When first erected, the current was to a certain extent successfully confined ; but the air is doing its work, abrasions are more easily made, and, without the adoption of genuine methods of control, "accidents" may be looked for in larger numbers as time goes on, due not only to deterioration of insulation, but to the multiplying of electric circuits to supply the popular demand for electric light.

The public may rest absolutely assured that safety will not be secured by burying these wires. The condensation of moisture, the ingress of water, the dissolving influence of coal gas and air-oxidation upon the various insulating compounds will result only in the transfer of deaths to man-holes, houses, stores, and offices, through the agency of the telephone, the low-pressure systems, and the apparatus of the high-tension current itself.

I have no intention, and I am sure none will accuse me, of being an alarmist. When the possibilities of the future are viewed in the light of recent developments, it must be apparent to every one that the time has come when those in authority should adopt proper and adequate measures for the protection of life and property, and my familiarity with the subject enables me to see very clearly the only true remedy which can be applied—namely, the regulation of electrical pressures. Once these pressures are reduced to a point which is harmless, the public may re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tire in security and leave electricians to discuss the merits or demerits of various methods of insulating, the defects of which will only concern those interested in the commerce of electricity.

There is no plea which will justify the use of high-tension and alternating currents, either in a scientific or a commercial sense. They are employed solely to reduce investment in copper wire and real estate. For instance, in arc-lighting it is customary to put forty lamps on each circuit; each lamp requires a pressure of fifty volts; therefore the total pressure on the circuit is two thousand volts. Now, if, instead of using only one wire for all these lamps, four circuits of ten lamps each were to be established, the pressure on each wire would be only five hundred volts. The weight of copper necessary for these four circuits of ten lamps each would be two and a half times greater than for one circuit of forty lamps—a question, as I have said, simply of investment.

The alternating current under high pressure and direct-current high-pressure systems are also employed, as I have intimated, to save investment in real estate as well as copper. If a certain district is to be supplied with electric light, the natural point from which the current should be distributed is the centre, with wires radiating toward the circumference of the circle of supply; and if, instead of including in any one of these districts an area so large that resort must be had to high pressure in order to reach its limits, the distributing power of a single station be confined to a capacity consistent with safety, and other centres sought from which to furnish current to other areas, the necessity for high electrical pressure vanishes. But real estate in such centres as these is expensive, and the promoters of electric-lighting enterprises which spring into existence with the growth and stability of the mushroom, cannot afford to consider permanency, the security of the public, the requirements of small consumers, or any such questions, which would incidentally involve the investment of larger sums of money; but, seeking the outskirts of a district, where land is cheap, or some abandoned building available for sheltering a few dynamo machines, they run small wires to the area of supply, enormous pressure being necessary to force the current through these small conductors over such long distances.

In the last issue of *The Electrical World*, page 254, is recorded a series of experiments conducted by M. d'Arsonval, a member of the French Academy of Sciences, showing "the effects of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuous and alternating currents on animals." He says: "A living being is, above all, sensible to a variable state of the current, from which it follows that at a mean equal pressure alternating currents are more dangerous than continuous currents"; and "with a battery of four hundred and twenty volts (continuous current) death is only caused by long-repeated interruptions of the current." In other words, the continuous current of the above pressure could not be made to cause death until it was interrupted or made discontinuous—or perhaps a better expression would be semi-continuous. By a variable state of the current is meant a fluctuation of pressure between different extremes of voltage. The human nerve-system, up to a certain limit of pressure, cannot detect the flow of a continuous current if the voltage be perfectly constant. This constancy is obtained by multiplying the number of commutator bars on the dynamo. The brushes which are set upon the revolving commutator, and conduct the current from the machine to the outside system, rest alternately upon the different bars of the commutator. The greater the number of bars, the less will be the fluctation of the current, which may be likened to a wave-motion, rising and falling, and producing that variable state referred to by the French scientist.

Nearly all dynamo machines used for arc-lighting are constructed with an insufficient number of commutator bars to produce a steady continuous current. The ranges of variable pressure are not, however, nearly as great as in the alternating system. With respect to the latter, M. d'Arsonval says: "An alternating Gramme machine caused death when above one hundred and twenty volts mean potential." This is a small unit to contemplate after the glib manner in which it has been recently stated that this current is harmless at a pressure of one thousand volts. I have myself seen a large healthy dog killed instantly by the alternating current at a pressure of one hundred and sixty-eight volts. It is a simple matter to calculate the ranges of variable pressure in this system. The dynamo machine has no commutator. The armature or "bobbin" is wound in such a way that the whole of the current under a pressure, say, of two thousand volts, is sent out on the wire first in one direction, then is reversed and sent out at the same pressure in the other direction, or passes through the wire in the opposite direction; and these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reversals are generally made about a hundred times in each second.

The variable state of a continuous current at a pressure of two thousand volts means ordinarily a rise from zero point up to two thousand, after which, owing to the action of the commutator, it varies between, say, seventeen hundred and two thousand, while the variable state of the alternating current means a fluctuation from two thousand volts above the zero point to two thousand below it, or a difference of four thousand volts. The danger to life is probably proportionate to the fluctuation of pressures. When an alternating current of fifteen volts is applied to a human being in the most effective manner, the effect upon the nerve system is so violent and the pain produced so great that it is absolutely impossible for any one to stand it.

As I have said before, the only way in which safety can be secured is to restrict electrical pressures. The continuous current should be limited to six hundred or seven hundred volts, with a variable range not exceeding a few volts. As for the alternating current, it is difficult for me to name a safe pressure. Its effect upon muscular action is so great that even at exceedingly low voltage the hand which grasps a conductor cannot free itself, and it is quite possible that in this way the sensitive nervous system of a human being could be shocked for a sufficient length of time to produce death. The electric-lighting company with which I am connected purchased some time ago the patents for a complete alternating system, and my protest against this action can be found upon its minute-book. Up to the present time I have succeeded in inducing them not to offer this system to the public, nor will they ever do so with my consent. My personal desire would be to prohibit entirely the use of alternating currents. They are as unnecessary as they are dangerous. In the city of New York there are many miles of conductors beneath the streets conveying a harmless continuous electric current to thousands of consumers, the maximum pressure on this vast system never exceeding two hundred and twenty volts, which will force so weak a current through the human body that it can barely be detected. Furthermore, it is found to be commercially successful, and I can therefore see no justification for the introduction of a system which has no element of permanency and every element of danger to life and property.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is no argument in favor of monopoly. If ever there is to be a monopoly of electric lighting in the United States, it will be neither delayed, prevented, nor circumnavigated by such subterfuges as these alternating systems, and their use cannot be justified on that score. I have always consistently opposed high-tension and alternating systems of electric lighting (although perfectly free to use them), not only on account of danger, but because of their general unreliability and unsuitability for any general system of distribution.

In contemplating the efforts of the officials of the city of New York to remedy the evils connected with electric lighting, I have been impressed in a way which must have impressed other onlookers. I refer to the apparent difficulty of determining where the authority to take action rests. The hands of those who wish to act appear to be tied, which is unfortunate, considering the exigencies and urgency of the case. In England they handle these matters better. The Electric-Lighting Act of 1882 provides in section 6

"that the Board of Trade may from time to time make such regulations as they may think expedient for securing the safety of the public from personal injury or from fire or otherwise, . . . and any regulations so made or amended by the Board of Trade shall from and after the date thereof have the like effect in every respect as though they had been originally inserted in the license, order, or special act authorizing the undertaking."

This same section also provides that

"any local authority within any part of whose district electricity is authorized to be supplied under any license, order, or special act, may, in addition to any regulations which may be made under the preceding provisions of this section for securing the safety of the public, from time to time, make, rescind, alter, or repeal by-laws for further securing such safety; and there may be annexed to any breach of such by-laws such penalties to be recovered in a summary manner as they may think necessary. Provided always that no such by-laws shall have any force or effect unless and until they have been confirmed by the Board of Trade and published in such manner as the Board of Trade may direct."

Thus to a responsible body is given discretionary power for the protection of the public, and local authorities (by which is meant any municipality) have the right to apply to this board for relief from any danger which they believe to exist in connection with electric-lighting systems. Certainly the responsibility for the protection of the people of our city should be as definitely placed, and those to whom such authority is given should adopt rigid rules for the restriction of electrical pressures. Perhaps police

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control would be even more adequate than the English system. I am not altogether familiar with the details of the system of boiler inspection which prevails in New York, but I believe it is very efficient and would serve as an excellent model for the case under discussion.

When the authorities require electrical pressures to be kept within the limits of safety, and when there is an efficient corps of inspectors, as in the case of boilers, to see that the rules adopted are carried out, the security which the public demand will be attained; but until then nothing better can be looked for than a multiplication of the casualties of the past few months.

THOMAS A. EDISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE UNION MEN OF THE SOUTH.

IN EVERY Southern State at the commencement of the rebellion there lived a class of men, prominent and influential in political and social life, whose patriotism, devotion to principle, wisdom and courage, trials and sufferings, have been scarcely touched upon by late writers upon the war and its causes and results. Most of them were then of mature years; all of them had been born and reared in the South. They were slave-owners and believed that slavery was right. Many of them were Democrats; none of them were Republicans. Most of them were disappointed at the election of Mr. Lincoln, and feared that his administration and that of the Republican party, which they considered sectional and aggressive, would be unfriendly, if not actually hostile, to the welfare of their section, where their pride, interests, and sympathies were all centred. Many of their wives, mothers, and daughters were Secessionists. Their sons, many of them, were the first to enlist in the Confederate ranks. These men doubted the policy of secession, and, with a courage and manhood which have no parallel, denounced the movement and predicted its failure and the ruin of the South. In so doing they knew that they were courting certain political ostracism and defeat, subjecting themselves to danger and perhaps to death, and to what was equally terrible to men of their pride and character—the changing of the love and confidence of their neighbors and friends, and even their kindred, into bitter hatred; and yet these men through all those dreary, doubtful years of war, some at their homes, some in the mountains, some in exile, some in prison, and others on the battle-field beneath the stars and stripes, never wavered or lost hope in the success of the one cause for which they had sacrificed and dared so much—the success of the Union arms.

Their voices were never heard among the croakers; when they could not approve the policy of the government, they fought on in silence; when colored troops were enlisted, they faltered not; when the Emancipation Proclamation swept away their fortunes, they did not complain. The success of one political party or the other was no victory to them, except as it indicated the determination of the people to preserve the government by suppressing the rebellion. They did not regard the war, as many writers do, as a war between the North and South, but between those everywhere who loved their government and those who wished to see it die; and if their hearts were not too full of sadness to harbor better feelings, those feelings went out toward the Northern "Copperhead" rather than toward their misguided or even their vicious neighbors. They did not consider it a rebellion of States, but a rebellion of rebels. They knew that they were sustained in their own section by thousands of Southerners as courageous and patriotic as themselves, and by hundreds of thousands who, though unable to give them active support, were praying for success.

In 1866, after the government had, rightfully or wrongfully, freed the slaves of those loyal men, along with the slaves of their rebel neighbors, and then feared to confer upon them the power to protect that freedom,—the ballot,—it was these same loyal Southern men who, in the memorable loyalists' convention at Philadelphia,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

persuaded—I might say forced—the dominant party to adopt that measure; and in the same spirit of liberality they opposed the proposition to disfranchise a large number of their white neighbors who had been engaged in rebellion. Next to their devotion to the Union, their desire for peace and good government in the South through a liberal policy by the victorious party was the aim and hope of these men. Then came reconstruction and the reorganization of political parties in the South. It must be written that the National Republican party, controlled by Northern politicians, in the exercise of its powerful political influence and the bestowal of its great patronage, in every Southern State and in almost every instance rejected the counsels of these brave and experienced men, and sought to build upon three elements only—the negro, the carpet-bagger, and a few new converts from the Confederate element. This is the only blur upon the otherwise magnificent record of that party.

W. W. MILLS.

II.

TAXATION OR NON-TAXATION FOR CHURCHES.

THE RECENT adoption by the Constitutional Convention of the new State of Washington of a provision requiring the taxation of all church property opens anew the question whether the time-honored policy of exempting churches and charitable institutions from their share in the ordinary burdens of the State is, after all, the wisest one to be pursued, and has a substantial foundation in common-sense. The argument most frequently heard in favor of exemption is that the practice is well established and has worked so well thus far in the world's history that any change of a revolutionary character would not only be unwise, but deeply injurious to the churches and the cause of religion generally. The wiser thought of the time, however, strongly favors a complete separation of church and state. The contention in favor of leaving charitable institutions free from taxation rests on a different basis from that which is applicable to churches, since the former may reasonably be considered to be of at least direct potential benefit to all the members of the community. There is a very large class of citizens who have no sympathy with the churches as such, but who, nevertheless, are compelled to bear their share of supporting them. There is an element of positive injustice in this, which the American people should be quick to perceive and resent.

Really, is not the plan of letting churches go free from tax-paying, on the ground that they act in a sense as a sort of moral police force, an old-fogy notion which the world has outgrown, and ought to have cast aside before this time? Consider for a moment how it is abused. Think of the enormous property owned by the Trinity Corporation in New York City, with which the Tax Department and the Board of Assessors have nothing to do, forsooth, because it is owned by a church! What an outrageous piece of injustice is this! Had a few other church enterprises gone into the same business, acquiring property on a large scale, without doubt the evil would have worked its own remedy long ago. For one I am glad to see the spirit that has been manifested in Washington. It is true that California has shown the way in this direction, and it is not apparent that the churches in that State have suffered on account of the policy there first put in operation. Some of the feebler churches may be injuriously affected by the necessity of paying their share of the taxes, but on the whole the tendency will be to prevent the erection of churches which have no adequate cause for existence and no "visible means of support." As the majority of church-goers are, presumably, tax-payers, it will in the end make no difference to them whether the taxes come out of their pockets directly or indirectly; and as for non-church-goers, who under our wise laws have the same rights, liberties, and privileges as the most devout regular attendants on Sunday worship, they will no longer be required to submit to the compulsion of paying their share toward the support of institutions in which they feel little, if any, interest, even if they do not entertain toward them feelings of positive hostility. Common-sense, the American spirit of fair play, and the demands of justice and of right dealing between man and man, and between one corporation and another, all justify and require the abolition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the antiquated and inequitable system of no taxation for churches. The Washington convention has taken a step in the right direction, and one that the people of that State ought to approve most heartily.

PHILO R. SYLVESTER.

III.

SOME EARLY HARVARD CUSTOMS.

WHETHER or not a "fast set" now exists at Harvard University is for others to determine, but that such a "set" should have existed during the early decades of the institution seems well-nigh impossible. He must, indeed, have been a bold and reckless youth who would dare to defy the iron-clad, steel-barred regulations with which the early fathers of New England encased the youthful tendencies of the rising generation. That these restrictions were submitted to by students of sufficient age and ability to "make and speak true Latin in verse and prose," according to the early requirements for admission, and to use the language in familiar conversation, their own tongue being prohibited,—"*Scholares vernaculâ linguâ intra collegii limites, nullo prætextu, utuntor*,"—is as certain as it is incredible. And they have transmitted to us ample evidence of their sound principles and scholarly attainments, as well as of their mental and moral force, which acted so potently on the growing affairs of the colonies.

Corporal punishment by "boxing" and by stripes, which must not be "inhuman or immoderate," was sanctioned by law for many years. In the year 1656 it was ordered by law "that the president and fellows of Harvard College for the time being, or the major part of them, . . . are hereby empowered, according to their best discretion, to punish all misdemeanors of the youth in their society, either by fine or whipping in the hall openly, as the nature of the offence shall require, not exceeding ten shillings, or ten stripes for one offence." These punishments were administered with a gravity becoming the offence and the dignity of the college government.

In the diary of Judge Samuel Sewall, "the good and wise," is recorded an instance of such public punishment for "speaking blasphemous words." The guilty person was condemned to be "publicly whipped before all the scholars"; to be "suspended from taking his bachelor's degree and to sit alone by himself, uncovered, at meals, during the pleasure of the president and fellows." The sentence was twice read publicly, and, after prayer by the president, the stripes were inflicted, the offender kneeling, and the president concluded the exercises with solemn prayer. The law permitting corporal punishment was not abolished for more than a century after the establishment of the college.

According to the Dunster code of laws, prepared by the first president, all sophisters and bachelors, "until themselves made commonplace," were required not only to attend church, and to refrain from "gestures that might show contempt or neglect of God's ordinances," but to repeat publicly the sermons in the hall after service. They might not, without permission, connect themselves with the artillery or "train band," nor go out of town or "pragmatically intrude or intermeddle in other men's affairs." If the student were of "known gravity" and "of approved sober and virtuous conversation," and if the president so decreed, he might be allowed to join a military band.

Miscellaneous purchases, or moneyed transactions of any sort, to the value of a sixpence, were distinctly forbidden, without the allowance of parents, guardians, or tutors (the latter word is invariably spelled with a capital), and any contraband article so bought, sold, or enchanged was liable to forfeiture at the discretion of the president.

The use of tobacco, except by order of a physician, consent of parents, or permission of the president, was not allowed. If a physician's certificate procured the privilege, the fragrant weed might be indulged in "in a sober and private manner."

In the year 1722, the gay youth of the college were forbidden, during the exercises of commencement week, to prepare or provide any such luxurious and ungodly viands as "plum cake, or roasted, boiled, or baked meats," and even the use of "pies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of any kind" was forbidden, together with "distilled liquors or any composition made therewith." The rooms of commencers were visited by the president and corporation, and contraband articles which were found were seized and fines imposed on the unlucky students. What would a Harvard student of the year 1889 think of a warning against violating the above decree by the use of "plain cake," the penalty actually being the withholding of the degree, or, if the degree had already been given, the name was to be left out of or "rased from the catalogue of the graduates."

As late as 1753 the overseers of the college recommended the corporation "to restrain unsuitable and unseasonable dancing." At one period Friday was fixed upon for commencement day, in order that there might be less remaining time in the week to be spent in frolicking. This decree, depriving the young people in the vicinity of a much-enjoyed holiday, was, however, soon reversed.

Very little respect seems to have existed for the judgment of the students, and President Mather writes of his reluctance to leave off preaching to a congregation of over one thousand souls, such as constituted his Boston church, and to devote his time, instead, to the exposition of the Word to "forty or fifty children, few of them capable of edification," by such exercises as the reverend president's tough theological discourses.

Regulations concerning students' commons were of similar severity, and in President Dunster's time the relations between the students and the butler, cook, and steward were established by a code of laws. The steward was relieved from the necessity of taking, in payment for debt, any pay "useless, hazardous, or importing detriment to the college, as lean cattle to feed, etc." No student, without the permission of the president or, in his absence, of the senior fellow, might leave the hall at meal-time before thanksgiving was ended. And one can easily imagine that a young man of lively disposition would need to exercise his wits to the utmost in order to provide any amusement beyond what could be found in the study of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin.

HELEN MARSHALL NORTH.

IV.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM AGAIN.

GENERAL JOHN POPE, in the September number of this REVIEW, declares that "the fact that any such system [of civil service] worked well in France or Germany or England would not only *not* be presumptive evidence that it would suit us, but actual proof that it would not." The reform of the civil service is but a logical step in the political development of England. The old system in England and in the United States was founded on the theory that public offices are the property of the ruler, and the experience of both countries shows conclusively how the radical vices of that system can be corrected. If the successful issue of the administrative method in England is conclusive evidence that it is not adapted to this country, then we should expunge from our constitution the theory of executive power, the division of government into three great departments with well-defined jurisdictions, two houses of legislation, with the whole body of parliamentary law, trial by jury, habeas corpus, the common law, with its vast stores of wisdom extending to all business and all personal relations, the long series of statutes so far as not repugnant to our system, criminal definitions and procedure, the theory of military as subordinate to civil authority, the political conception of domestic and individual rights and duties, drawn from the same source from which flowed our blood, language, and civilization. The science of administration has made much greater progress in Great Britain than in the United States, striking deeper into the social life and political system. The merit system has proved highly successful in the Federal administration as well as in the States of New York and Massachusetts, and in the great municipalities of New York, Brooklyn, Boston, and many others. The fact that any principles of political action have been found salutary in one country is by no means a sufficient reason for introducing them into another. The probability that they may be salutary increases with all that is in common in the race of language,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religion, laws, institutions, and civilization. Because found salutary in England it by no means follows that this system is not republican in spirit and consistent with the practical administration of government under our institutions.

General Pope declares that there cannot be "a greater or more misleading fallacy than the oft-repeated saying that 'the business of the government should be conducted on business methods.'" The vast clerical force at Washington and in the large offices throughout the country are not representative officers, and there is no sphere for partisan activity or opinions in the honest and faithful performance of their work. A department, custom-house, or post-office is a mere business agency for the transaction of the business of the whole people economically and efficiently, and it should be conducted by the same business methods, no matter which party is in power.

General Pope speaks of an "order or a law"—he does not seem to know which—that deprives one hundred thousand citizens of all participation in public affairs except what is covered by a mere vote; says that they are practically disfranchised and deprived of half their rights and duties as citizens, and that they are political eunuchs, incapacitated for the duties of good citizens. The Civil-Service Act and rules, on the contrary, give independence and full liberty to office-holders to express opinions and exercise the duties of citizenship by forbidding removals for refusing to pay political assessments, or for refusal to be coerced in political action, or for refusal to render political service. The only "order or law" which General Pope could have had in mind must have been an order issued by President Cleveland, which declared that "office-holders are the agents of the people—not their masters."

Party government and the salutary activity of parties are thus made purer and more efficient. The authority and time of officials should not be prostituted to the servile work of partisan politics, and political assessments extorted under the fear of removal. Every honest interest and zeal in political contests are open to every office-holder under the merit system.

General Pope advances the novel suggestion that the Representative in Congress is the person whose recommendation should carry most weight in appointments to public office. In 1869 a Representative said in a debate in the House: "It is no more a part of a Representative's duty to seek and dispose of executive offices than to solicit pardons for traitors or condemned criminals." In a debate in 1870 another Representative said: "I appeal to the members of the House if it is not one of the greatest curses of the position of a member of Congress that there are continual demands made on his time and patience by persons whom it is utterly impossible for him to satisfy, who demand that he shall secure offices for them." The chief labor of the President, collectors, and postmasters has been to reward the personal friends and punish the personal foes of the leaders of the dominant faction of the dominant party. To consult Congressmen in appointments is to ignore the motives that rule human conduct in practical affairs. Without patronage Congressmen may represent the will of the people, but with it they do not.

In March, 1870, Mr. Garfield said in the House of Representatives: "We press appointments upon the departments; we crowd the doors. . . . Senators and Representatives throng the offices and the bureaus until the public business is obstructed, . . . and men are appointed, not because they are fit for their positions, but because we ask it. . . . There, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, is the true field for retrenchment and reform; . . . in this direction is the true line of statemanship." Seven years later, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Mr. Garfield said that "one-third of the working hours of Senators is hardly sufficient to meet the demands upon them in reference to appointments. . . . The present system impairs the efficiency of the legislators; . . . it degrades the civil service; . . . it repels from the service those high and manly qualities which are so essential to a pure and efficient administration; and, finally, it debauches the public mind by holding up public office as the mere reward of party zeal." In his message in 1870 President Grant said: "The present system does not secure the best men, and not often fit men, for the public service." A committee of the Senate in 1882 said: "The malign influence of political domination in appointments to office is widespread, and reaches out from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President himself to all possible means of approach to the appointing power. It poisons the very air we breathe. No Congressman in accord with the dispenser of power can escape it. . . . The late Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom, is reported to have said that five-sixths of the applicants for office, while he administered the Treasury, based their claims, not on merits, fitness, or character, but on their poverty and incapacity to otherwise obtain a livelihood."

General Pope would aggravate the administrative disorder which prevails in the United States by giving a monopoly of office and plunder to the victorious party, allowing an irresponsible body dominated by professional office-seekers and office-holders to usurp the election of President, and by having appointments to places outside of Washington made on the recommendation of the local Congressman, to the confusion of executive and legislative functions, of Federal and State authority, besides being impracticable, even according to General Pope's theory, as some of the Congressmen "would oppose the policies which the people commanded to be carried out," and not be fit instruments. Kent, in his "Commentaries," is of the opinion that the President's power of nomination is, for all the useful purposes of restraint, equivalent to the power of appointment, and that, if the President were not expressly invested with the exclusive right of nomination, the organization of the executive department would be very unskilful, and the government degenerate into a system of cabal, favoritism, and intrigue.

Some of the evils of patronage have been suppressed by Congress and the Executive. The tenth section of the Civil-Service Act of January 16, 1883, declares that "no recommendation of any person who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act, which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any examination or appointment under this act." The President has made, in the civil-service rules, the use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or controlling the result thereof, punishable by dismissal from office; and declared that "any appointing or nominating officer who shall make inquiries concerning, or in any other way attempt to ascertain, the political or religious opinion or affiliations of any eligible, or who shall discriminate in favor of or against any eligible because of the eligible's political or religious opinions or affiliations, shall be dismissed from office." The rules also provide that selections for appointments shall be made from the three highest in grade certified for appointment on the basis of merit shown on the examinations.

William H. Seward, in his life of John Quincy Adams, describes the opposition to the administration of Mr. Adams as more determined, bitter, and unscrupulous than any which has ever assailed a President of the United States; but yet he says of him: "His views of the sacred nature of the trust imposed upon him by his fellow-citizens were too exalted to allow him to desecrate the power with which it clothed him to the promotion of party or personal interests. . . . Neither did an opposition to his administration alone, except there was a marked practical unfitness for office, ever induce him to remove an individual from a public station."

It is needless to multiply quotations. The merit system commends itself as republican in spirit and the only sound basis for an efficient and economical public service. The old spoils system is doomed. The competitive system is fixed as a part of our institutions as permanent as it is salutary. Within the sphere of the system, Congress and appointing officers have been relieved of demoralizing solicitation, and vicious intrigues and bargains for office are diminished. Twenty-eight thousand places are no longer spoils to be promised for votes or as rewards for partisan work. The public estimate of official life has been raised. Office is being more and more regarded as a public trust. The cause of public-school education has been greatly advanced. Hence sounder principles and superior candidates have become more necessary to party success.

JOHN T. DOYLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED